वरेन्द्र-अनुसन्धान-समिति-ग्रन्थमाला

काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य्यश्रीजिनेन्द्रबुद्धिपादविरचिता

शास्त्रिश्रीश्रीशचन्द्रचक्रवर्त्तिभट्टाचार्य्येण संस्कृता ।

THE

KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKA

(THE NYASA)

A COMMENTARY ON VAMANA-JAYADITYA'S KASIKA

BY

JINENDRA BUDDHI.

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES

BY

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, B A

READER OF SANSKRIT, DACCA UNIVERSITY.

Vol. I

(Adhyayas 1—4).

PUBLISHED BY

THE VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY,

RAJSHAHI, BENGAL

1913—1916

वरेन्द्र-अनुसन्धान-समिति-ग्रन्थमाला

काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य्यश्रीजिनेन्द्रबुद्धिपादविरचिता

शास्त्रिश्रीश्रीशचन्द्रचक्रवर्त्तिभट्टाचार्य्येण संस्कृता ।

THE

KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKA

(THE NYASA)

A COMMENTARY ON VAMANA-JAYADITYA'S KASIKA

BY

JINENDRA BUDDHI.

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES

BY

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, B. A.

READER OF SANSKRIT, DACCA UNIVERSITY.

Vol. II. Part I.

(Adhyaya 5).

PUBLISHED BY
THE VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY
RAJSHAHI, BENGAL

1919

वरेन्द्र-अनुसन्धान-समिति-ग्रन्थमाला

काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका।

बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य्यश्रीजिनेन्द्रबुद्धिपादविरचिता

शास्त्रिश्रीश्रीशचन्द्रचक्रवर्त्तिभट्टाचार्य्येण संस्कृता।

THE

KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKA

(THE NYASA)

A COMMENTARY ON VAMANA-JAYADITYA'S KASIKA

BY

JINENDRA BUDDHI.

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES

BY

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, B A

READER OF SANSKRIT, DACCA UNIVERSITY

Vol. II. Part II.

(Adhyaya 6)

PUBLISHED BY

THE VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY,

RAJSHAHI, BENGAL

1924

KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKA
Vol II

शुद्धिपत्रम्

पृष्ठायाम्	पङ्क्तौ	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
५४	२४	लशून	लशुन
८४	२५	कश्चिन् · कश्चित्	क्वचिन्· क्वचित्
१८६	२०	व्यवधानोऽपि	व्यवधानेऽपि
२१६	२१	एतश्च	ततश्च
,,	२२	विशेषं दर्शयति···ननु विशेषं	
२२६	२७	सम्बन्ध	सम्बद्ध
३११	१५	कन्निति	क्वन्निति
३२२	९,१२	समरणौ	श्रमरणौ
३५४	४	त्यवन्तः	त्यवन्तः
४०८	१८	नोपगर्गे	सोपसर्गे
,,	२२	संहत	संहित
,,	२६	एकोऽर्थौ	एकोऽभिन्नोऽर्थौ
५२९	२३	ङ्किति	क्ङिति
५३०	१८	ङ्किति	क्ङिति
५४०	१७ १८	,,	,,
५५६	२६	अवाप्युरिति	अवाप्सुरिति

KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKA

Vol III

शुद्धिपत्रम्

पृष्ठायाम्	पङ्क्तौ	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
७२०	११	मम्मार्ग	सन्मार्ग
७४८	१६	तथाप्यर्त	तथाप्यात
७७३	८	बाधको	बाधकौ
,,	२८	यौविशेष्येत	यौ विशिष्येते
७७८	९	भावार्थे	भवार्थे
८१९	११	चिण् नलोप	चिण्णलो
८२४	२४	पृतान	पृक्त
८३१	१५	वा	वचनमाश्रित्य
८७१	७	विधायर्त	विधीयते
८९५	२५	प्रयोक्त्	प्रयोक्तृ
९१६	१	कारण	कारणं
९३०	४	लडन्त।	लडन्तम्।
९४५	२५	षा	येषां
,,	२६	पुत्रभाव	पुत्रभावः
,,	,,	यदपेक्ष	यदपेक्षं
९८५	२१	कुञ्चेति	क्रुञ्चेति
९९५	१९	इष्ट	इष्टः
१०००	२६	मच	मच

and "परन्तु न्यास ··गृहीत." is to go before "भाष्ये त्वयं···"

पृष्ठायाम्	पङ्क्तौ	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
१००३	२४	रकार	वकार
,,	२६	गूरी	गुरी
१००४	२१	इट्	ईट्
१०३०	१७	दोधिक	दोधक
,,	२०	स्वयम्	स्वयम्
१०९१	११	क्विप्रत्ययान्तः	क्विप्रत्ययान्ताः
११०६	२२	तदुत्तरमित्येष	तदुत्तरपदमित्येष
११२१	७	विधि	विधे
११२२	१०	ततेह्रा	ततेह्रा
,,	१६	मचि	मचिं

II

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE MSS

USED IN PREPARING THE PRESS COPY

of the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका।

(1) The first MS (घ) contains I 4 (A), II 1 2 3, III I, VII 2 and VIII 1 It is owned by the Rajshahi Government College For details see notes in P 332 and P 790 vol I

(2) The second MS (ग) contain I 2 3 4 and II 1 2 3 4 Details are given in note P 332 vol I

(3) The third MS (भ) is with only I 3 and II 4

(4) The 4th MS (ज) cotainning I 2, III 1 2 and VI 1 4, At the end of 1-2 it has श्रीशत्रुघ्नशर्मणा लिखितम्। At the end of its 3-2 is श्रीकाशीपतिशर्मण पुस्तकमिदम्। लिखित श्रीजगन्मोहनसेनेन। शकाब्दा १७३० आषाढस्य तृतीयदिवसे। शक १७३० is 1808 A D Its pages were found torn in some places But it is a correct copy At the end of 6-4 is

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिक्षौणीशाके सिंहगते रवौ।

व्यालेखि न्यासटीकेयं श्रीकृष्णानन्दशर्मणा ॥१॥

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिक्षौणीशक is १७०१ that is 1779 A D Elsewhere is शाक १७३९ that is 1817 A D See details in note P 790 vol I

(5) The 5th MS (त) contains VII 1, 2, 3, 4 and VIII 1 2 3 4, For fuller account of this and of the MSS 11, 12, 20 and 21 vide pp 883-4 in vol II It is an excellent, faithful and very correct MS got from Bengal We have in the 5th MS VIII 2 though mutilated This and the प्रत्याहार Section and 1 I are very rare in Bengal, and after much trouble we had been successful in procuring the Bengal recension of them

(6) The Sixth MS (भ) contains III 1

(7) The 7th MS (ञ) is with III 2 See note P 790, vol I

(8) The 8th MS (ठ) is with III, 4 See note P 790, vol I

(9) The 9th MS (ख) It was from the Deccan College Poona, kindly lent by the late lamented Professor Ghate It has प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 4, IV 1 2 3 4 and V 1 2 3 4 See page 331 and Page 1061 notes, vol I

(10) The 10th MS (प) is with V 1 3 Its copyist and owner was one श्रीकान्तशर्म्मा।

(11) The 11th MS (फ) containing II 1, 2, VI 3 and VII 1 2 3 4 It has at the end लिखिता श्रीरामकान्तशर्म्मणा। A very good and correct MS

(A) 1-4 indicates the fourth pada (or section) of the 1st Adhyaya and similarly 2 1 or 2-1 is the 1st pada of the 2nd Adyaya and so on.

(12) The 12th MS (छ) has 1 3 II 1 2 3, IV 1 VII 1 2 3 4 and VIII 1 4 see note P 484

(13) The 13th MS (क) is with प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 and II 1 2 3 4 see note 331 vol I This is the Bengal MS containing the प्रत्याहार and I 1 or the beginning of the न्यास। It is the property, and is now in the office, of the वरेन्द्र society

(14) The 14th MS (ग) with VIII 3 is from the village शालिखा, Rajshahi It has at the end श्रीशिवरामशर्म्मण स्वाक्षरम्। शकाब्दा १६४६ i e 1724 A D

(15) The 15th MS (ग) is with VI 4

(16) The 16th MS (घ) is with 1 4 see note p 332, vol I

(17) The 17th MS (ढ) is from the Deccan College, Poona It contains II 1 2 3 4 See note P, 484 vol I

(18) The 18th MS (द) has VII 2 and VIII 4 vide note P 884 vot II

(19) The 19th MS (ब) has VII 3 4 vide note P 884 vol II

(20) The 20th MS (ब) is with VII 1 2 3 and VIII 1 2 3 At the end of 7-1 is शुभमस्तु शकाब्दा १६९५ i e 1773 A D At the end of VIII 1 is तिङो गोवादीनीति। अत शेषभागस्य दशनाभावान्न स लिखित। So it is incomplete Infact the Vedic portions of the Book were mostly lost in Bengal It was from other provinces of India that they were to be procured

(21) The 21st MS (ष) is with II 1, VII 1 4 and VIII 1 3

(22) The 22nd MS (ङ) with III 3 and IV 2 It is a copy written in Devanagar, duly compared and certified, from the MS on the palm leaves in Canarese characters at the Sravan Belgolah Jain temple, Mysore It was got in 1915 See note P 791, vol 1

(23) The 23rd MS (ढ) with VI 3 4 and VIII 3 4, was got from the village वद्यवेलघरिया, Rajshahi, from the house of पण्डित शिवचन्द्रसिद्धान्त।

(24) The 24th MS is with III 3 See note P 791 vol I

(25) The 25th MS (स) is also a copy in Devanagar certified as duly compared with the original from the aforesaid Sravan Belgolad MS prepared like the copy of the MS XXII Its contents are VI 1 2 and VIII 1 2 But VI, 2 VIII 2 were incomplete

(26) The 26th MS (य) is with VI 2 This is a portion of the Kasmir MS and a copy in Devanagar, certified as duly compared It has been got from the Superintedent Research Deparment,Srinagar, Jamoo Kasmir State, Kasmir

(27) The 27th MS (र) contains VI 2, and VIII I 2 It has been procured from the Oriental Library Barada, Gaequare's State The MS in this Library also is not complete and contains only V, VI, VII and some portions of VIII It is in the Devanagar characters and were written in 1463 सवत् i e 1406 A D I am indebted to Mr Benoytosh Bhattacharya M A Superintendent. of the aforesaid Library for photo graphed facsimiles of the portions of V 2 & VIII 1 & 2, while we were extremely in want of them

APPENDIX

I

After the printing of the VI 2, based mainly on the Kasmir MS had been finished, the photoed facsimiles of the Baroda MS of the same came to us On comparison it is found that the latter contains some differently worded and some additional and some common statements in the Sutras 197 and 199 of VI 2 though all other Sutras of the section are identical in both As the Kasmir MS given to us was a transcript and the Baroda one is a photoed facsimile, the original of which had been written so early as 1406 A D the latter seems to be the genuine thing So the version as found in the Barada MS regarding the Sutras 197 and 199 of VI 2 is printed below —

In the case of the remaining Sutras of the entire Nyasa the MSS from the different quarters have been found throughout as precisely identical excepting a few slight and occasional variants All these variants have been noticed in due places

१९७। द्वित्रिभ्यां पाद्दन्मूर्धसु बहुव्रीहौ।

द्वित्रिभ्यामिति। दिग् योगलक्षणा (२।३।२९) पञ्चमी। पाददन्मूर्धस्विति। यस्य च भावेन भावलक्षणमिति (२।३।६७) भावलक्षणा सप्तमी। द्विपात् त्रिपादिति। पादस्य लोपोऽहस्त्यादिभ्यः (५।४।१३८)। संख्यासुपूर्वस्येत्यकार-लोपः (५।४।१४०)। पादशब्दो घञन्तत्वादाद्युदात्तइति पाच्छब्दस्याद्युदात्तएव भवति। द्विदन्निति। वयसि दन्तस्येति (५।४।१४१) दत्रादेशः। दन्तशब्द आद्युदात्त इत्युक्तम्। तेन दत्रादेशोऽपि स्थानिवद्भावेनाद्युदात्तएव भवति। द्विमूर्धेति। मूर्धशब्दः श्वन्नुक्षन्पूषन् प्लीहन्नित्यादिना रन्-(उण्, १।१५७) प्रत्ययान्तो निपात्यते। तेनाद्युदात्तः। मूर्धन्नित्यादि। द्वित्रिभ्या षो मूर्ध्न इति (५।४।११५) षः समासान्त प्राप्नोति। स न कृतः। तेनात्र नान्तएव मूर्धशब्दः। किं पुनः कारणमकृतसमासान्त एव मूर्धन्शब्द उपात्त इत्यत आह तस्येत्यादि। यदि कृतसमासान्त उपादीयेत तदा सत्येव समासान्तेऽन्तोदात्तत्वं स्यात्। असति न स्यात्। तस्मादसत्यपि समासान्तेऽन्तोदात्तत्व यथा स्यादित्येतत् प्रयोजनमकृत-समासान्तनिर्देशस्य। ननु च नित्यमेव समासान्तेन भवितव्यम्। तत् कुतस्तस्या-सत्त्वमित्यत आह एतदेवेत्यादि। यदिदमस्य प्रयोजनस्य सम्पादनार्थमकृत-समासान्तस्य मूर्धन् शब्दस्योपादानम् एतदेव ज्ञापकम् अनित्यः समासान्तो भवतीति। तेन द्विमूर्धत्यादिप्रयोग उपपन्नो भवति। यदि तर्ह्यकृतसमासान्त इह मूर्धन्शब्द उपात्त एवं सति यदा समासान्तः क्रियते तदान्तोदात्तेन न भवितव्यम्। कृतसमासान्तस्य शब्दान्तरत्वादित्यत आह यद्यपीत्यादि। इह हि बहुव्रीहिः कार्यी। तदेकदेशित्वञ्च समासान्तस्य। एकदेशोऽस्यास्तीत्येकदेशी। स बहुव्रीहि

रेकदेशी यस्य समासान्तस्य स तदेकदेशी । तद्भावस्तदेकदेशित्वम् । एतेन बहुव्रीह्यवयवत्वं समासान्तस्य दर्शयन कृतसमासान्तस्य शब्दान्तरत्वं निरस्यति। तदेवं यस्मादिह बहुव्रीहिः कार्यो तदेकदेशित्वञ्च समासान्तस्य तस्माद् यदापि समासान्त' क्रियते तदापि पचेन्तोदात्तत्वं भवत्येव। कल्याणमूर्धेति। कल्याणशब्दो नब्विषयस्येत्याद्युदात्तः (फिट्, २६)। द्वयो मूर्धेति। अत्र नित्यमेव समासान्तोदात्तत्वं भवति।

१९९। परादिश्छन्दसि बहुलम्।

परशब्देनात्र सकथशब्दएव गृह्यतइति। प्रत्यासत्तेः। स हि पूर्वसूत्रे सन्निहितत्वात् प्रत्यासन्नः। यद्येवं परशब्दग्रहणमनर्थकम्। सकथशब्दएव ह्यत्रानुवर्त्तिष्यते। नैतदस्ति। बहुव्रीहिग्रहणमप्यत्रानुवर्त्ततइति तस्याप्याद्युदात्तत्वमाशङ्क्येत। अञ्जिमकथमिति। अञ्जिशब्द' प्रातिपदिकस्वरेणान्तोदात्तः। अथाप्यञ्ज शब्दान् मत्वर्थइनिः क्रियत एवमप्यन्तोदात्तएव। लोमशसकथमिति। (A) लोमादिपामादिपिच्छादिभ्यः शनेलच इति (५।२।१००) शप्रत्ययान्तत्वाल्लोमशशब्दोऽन्तोदात्तः। ऋजुबाहुरिति। कुभ्रश्चेत्यधिकृत्य (उण्, १।२२) अर्जिदशिकम्यमिपशिबाधामृजिपशितुगधुग्दीर्घहकारश्चेति (उण, १।२७) कुप्रत्ययान्तौ ऋजुबाहुशब्दौ। तेनान्तोदात्तौ। वाक्पतिश्चित्पतिरिति। षष्ठीसमासावेतौ। अत्रोत्तरमाद्युदात्तं भवति। बहुलग्रहणात्। विभाषाग्रहणे हि प्रकृते बहुलग्रहणेन यत् सिध्यति तद्दर्शनार्थं मुपन्यस्तः। व्यत्ययो बहुलं ततइति। यत एवं बहुलग्रहणेनानेन कार्य्ये सिध्यति तेन व्यत्ययो बहुलं भवति। ननु च पूर्वमेव स्वराणा व्यत्ययो विहित'। सत्यमेतत्। तस्यैव तु प्रपञ्चोऽयम्। परादि रुदाहृतइति। वाक्पतिश्चित्पतिरिति। अत्र च परग्रहणेनोत्तरपदमुक्तम्। अन्तोदात्तप्रकरणइति। अन्तः (६।२।१४३)। थाथघञ्क्ताजबित्रकाणामित्यादौ (६।२।१४४)। पूर्वपदान्तोदात्तप्रकरणइति। अन्तः (६।२।९२)। सर्व्वं गुणकार्त्स्न्य इत्यादौ (६।२।९३)। पूर्वपदाद्युदात्तप्रकरण इति। आदिरुदात्त. (६।२।६४) सप्तमीहारिणौ धर्म्येऽहरण इत्यादौ (६।२।६५)। एवमादि सर्वं संगृहीतं भवतीति। बहुलग्रहणेन। यतस्तेन विभाषाग्रहणे प्रकृते बहुलग्रहनं कृत मित्यभिप्रायः। त्रिचक्रादीना पूर्वमेव पूर्वोत्तरपदस्वर उक्तइति पुनरिह नोच्यते॥

इति षष्ठाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः॥२॥

(A) मुद्रितकाशिकायान्तु त्वाष्ट्रौ लोमसक्थाविति पाठ। न्यासकारस्तु लोमशसकथाविति पठति।

The काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका।

INTRODUCTION.

शेषाशेषार्थविद् यो मा शेषाशेषगवीः स्फुटम्।
विशिष्याऽऽख्यापयद् वन्दे तं शेषमशेषमसम्॥ १॥

Before entering into some accounts of Jinendra Buddhi, the main facts hitherto ascertained in connection with the chief grammarians of the Panini school, who had preceded that author, may be briefly noticed here In absence of authentic details, they are no doubt often found full of confusion and unfit for yielding any sure conclusion Yet the importance of the subject demands a review of them and hence this digression is made regarding those authors

I पाणिनि।

This ancient and great grammarian of India is known only by his aphorisms (Sutras) They form his work called the अष्टाध्यायी or the (पाणिनीय) अष्टक He did not amplify these Sutras with any explanations or illustrations As to the grammarians anterior to पाणिनि, the अष्टाध्यायी furnishes the names of ten sages viz आपिशलि, काश्यप, गार्ग्य, गालव, चाक्रवर्म्मण, भारद्वाज, शाकल्य, शाकटायन, सेनक and स्फोटायन, (1) Panini's age is a debatable matter Scholars have assigned different periods to it Some give 2400 B C, some 900 B C, some 650 B C, some 550 B C, and others 350 B C as his age The कथासरित्सागर makes पाणिनि, कात्यायन and व्याडि all co-eval with the king Nanda of Magadha But as a story book, it may not be true in its chronology Rajshekhara's statement in his काव्यमीमांसा merely asserts that these sages were examined and put on test at Pataliputra and obtained fame But it does not imply that they lived there at one and the same time or even assembled there ever simultaneously (2) So no reliance can be put on such statements as to their synchronisation

The word यवन occurs in his sutra 4 1 49, लिपि in 3 2 21 मनु in 4 1 161 and यस्क in (2 4 63) We find also in the अष्टाध्यायी the words अत्रि, भृगु, कुतस,

---

(1) Though in the गणपाठ, पौष्करसादि occurs in the तौल्वलादि (२।४।६१), काशकृत्स्न in the उपकादि (२।४।६९), दाक्षायण in the ऐषुकार्यादि (४।२।५४) and व्याडि is in the क्रौड्यादि (४।१।८०) गहादि (४।२।१३८), and छात्र्यादिगण (६।२।८६), they cannot be taken as coming from Panini himself The गणपाठ was not the work of a single author It was subsequently enlarged by others

(2) "श्रूयते च पाटलिपुत्रे शास्त्रकारपरीक्षा।
अत्रोपवर्षवर्षाविह पाणिनिपिङ्गलाविह व्याडिः।
वररुचिपतञ्जली इह परीक्षिताः ख्यातिमुपजग्मुः॥" इति काव्यमीमांसायाम्।

वसिष्ठ, गोतम, अङ्गिरस् (2 4 65) अगस्त्य, कौण्डिन्य (2 4 70) कद्रु (4 1.71) द्रोण, अन्धक, वृष्णि, कुरु, सौवीर, वासुदेव, अर्जुन, भारत (6 2 38), इक्ष्वाकु (6 8 178) मित्रयु, गान्धारि and such others and some geographical terms such as उशीनर, गौड (6 2 100), वाह्लीक, त्रिगर्त्त, मगध, सूरमस, कलिङ्ग, कोशल, आजाद, साल्व, अश्मक, कम्बोज, अवन्ति, कुन्ति, विपाश्, सुवास्तु, कापिशी, काशी, मद्र, वृजि, युगन्धर, कच्छ, विदूर, सिन्धु, तक्षशिला, तूदी, शलातुर, वर्मती, कूचवार, सरयू (6 8 178), कैकय, चर्म्मण्वती, चागराट, &c as well, in addition to such aphorisms as सङ्कलादिभ्यश्च (4 2 75), पर्श्वादियौधेयादिभ्योऽणञौ (5 3 117), &c These are taken as good hints for determining his time. (3)

The aphorisms कुमारः श्रमणादिभिः (२।१७०), पाराशर्य्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयोः (४।३।११०) कर्मन्दकृशाश्वादिनिः (४।३।१११), मस्करमस्करिणौ वेणुपरिव्राजकयोः (६।१।५४), निर्वाणोऽवाते (८.२।५०) &c indicate that there had existed at the time when the Grammarian lived, or before him, some other religion or religions side by side with Brahminism This is clear enough from the meanings which are assigned by the भाष्यकार. to the words श्रमण and मस्करिण् ।

There is no doubt that Sanskrit was a colloquial language of the people of Northern India (आर्य्यावर्त्त) for some centuries in ancient time It ceased to be so, probably some two hundred years after patanjali' date Though thus dead, it remained still long enough as the exclusive property of the Brahmins. The Buddhist, always jealous of it, began at first to adopt a sort of broken Sanskrit and ultimately made Pali their chief tongue Patanjali, in the second century B C, testified that Sanskrit was a current language spoken even by ordinary people He speaks of a charioteer, certainly not a Brahmin, correcting the derivation of a Sanskrit word misinterpreted by a student of Grammar (भाष्य 2 4 6) Again in the भाष्य of 8 2 83, we find a man jeering another in Sanskrit (4) Nay, long before the भाष्यकार, Sanskrit had been also a

---

(3) Dr S K Belvalkar, Professor, Deccan College, Poona, says "Here the *Parsus* or the Persians and the *Asuras* or the Assyrians are mentioned as an आयुधजीविसंघ or an organisation of mercenary fighters similar to the Greeks of the 4th century B C or the Germans of the 17th century The Persians were blotted out as a political power in B C 329 and the Assyrians in 538 B C" (Systems of Sanskrit Grammar) The city साङ्कल, Gr Sangal, was totally destroyed by Alexander in 326 B C

(4) (i) एव हि कश्चिद् वैयाकरण आह "कोऽस्य रथस्य प्रवेतेति'। सूत आह "अहमायुष्मन्नस्य रथस्य प्राजितेति'। वैयाकरण आह "अपशब्द इति।" सूत आह "प्राप्तिज्ञो देवानांप्रिय'। न त्विष्टिज्ञ.। इष्यत एतद्रूपमिति'। वैयाकरण आह "अहो खल्वनेन दुरुतेन बाध्यामहे इति'। सूत आह 'न खलु वेञः सूत । सुवतेरेव सूत । यदि सुवते कुत्सा प्रयोक्तव्या दु:सूतेनेति वक्तव्यम्।" (भाष्य (2 4 56) (ii) "स्थालो अहं भोः।" 'आयुष्मानेधि स्थालि"न्।" "नैषा मम सञ्ज्ञा स्थालीति"। 'किं तर्हि"? "दण्डिन्यायी मम विवक्षित । स वक्तव्य । स्थालो अहं भोः।' "आयुष्मानेधि स्थालिन्।" "न मम दण्डिन्यायी विवक्षित।" "किं तर्हि?" "सञ्ज्ञा ममैषा।" "असूयकस्त्वमसि जाल्म ! न त्वं प्रत्यभिवादनमर्हसि। भिद्यस्व वृषल। स्थालिन्।'—(भाष्य, 8 2. 83) दण्डिन्याय alludes to the etymological meaning of the word दण्डिन् i.e अस्त्यर्थ, दण्डोऽस्त्यस्येति। So

language of conversation Otherwise Panini would not have taken so much care to prepare hundreds of Sutras on accents of words, with extreme nicety and sharp minuteness Consider the Sutra उद्क् च विपाश (4 2 74) It regulates the derivation of such words as दात्त, गौप्त, &c with affixes अञ् and अण्, without altering the sense, for different accents in them They were pronounced in one way by the people living in the north bank of the river विपाशा (Beas) and in a different way by those who lived on its Southern bank Struck with such keen knowledge and nice discrimination of the sage, जयादित्य the author of the Kasikavritti, speaks out in his praise महती सूक्ष्मेक्षिका वर्त्तते सूत्रकारस्य (काशिका, 4 2 74) Such care and exertions to preserve the purity of a language must have been taken when it was in its balmy days of glory and in the full vigour of its coloquial state It could not be at a time when Pali was slowly and gradually setting aside Sanskrit

The Sutra भिद्योद्ध्यौ नदे (3 1 115) presents the names of two rivers It is wholly obscure where and when these rivers existed How and when they were defunct are also mysterious They had certainly existed once There is no reason why the grammarian should falsely or uselessly give us a Sutra, referring to two never existing rivers The terminologist cannot be supposed either crazy or sportive to issue such things merely from his imagination So the disappearance of the rivers भिद्य and उद्ध्य at a time somehow immemorial, may stand against the view which alleges पाणिनि as flourishing so late as the fourth century B C Considering all these and the references cited above from his Sutras, and taking व्याडि as the author of the संग्रह and prior to कात्यायन because of his naming the former in the Vartikas, we differ from the great scholars who take the Grammarian as a man of about the time of Nanda the king of Magadha We think him as flourishing at least half a century earlier than 500 B C

The Grammarian shows his marvellous acquaintance with ancient manners and customs of the people of several countries The term कौशेय comes from the Sutra कोशाड्ढञ् (4 3 42) and means a sort of silk cloth It was a production of industry which is said to have been current only in China in time sufficiently old (5) Here पाणिनि supplies a very early information regarding cocoon Consider again the Sutra मनुष्यतत्स्थयोर्वुञ् (4 2 134).

स्थालिन् means स्थानमस्यस्येति। If स्थालिन् be a संज्ञा i e the name of a person, its last vowel is to be pronounced as prolated (प्लुत) in re address (प्रत्यभिवादन) But in its derivative (यौगिक) sense, its last vowel shall not be प्लुत।

(5) कौशेय क्रमिकोशोत्थमित्यमरः। "कोशे सभूत कौशेय वस्त्रम्। रूढिरेषा। तेन क्रिमौ न भवति। खड्गकोशाचेति" काशिका। निर्नाभिकौशेयमुपात्तबाणमिति कालिदासः। As such silk used to come from China, it was often called चीनांशुक। We have in कालिदास,—"चीनांशुकमिव केतोः प्रतिवातं नीयमानस्य', again "चीनांशुक कल्पितकेतुमालम्।'

By this, such forms as काच्छक, सैन्धवक, वार्णवक, काश्मीरक, कौलूतक & are formed from terms कच्छ, सिन्धु, वर्णु, काश्मीर, कुलूत, & which indicate countries and the derivative words imply the residents of those countries as well as their manners and customs, e g काच्छको मनुष्य। काच्छकमस्य हसित जल्पितम्। काच्छिका चूडा। सैन्धवको मनुष्यः। सैन्धवकमस्य हसित जल्पितम्। सैन्धविका चूडा and so on Take another, सञ्ज्ञायां कन्थोशीनरेषु (2 4 20) A kind of कन्था (quilt) used in the country of उशीनर acquired a technical sense on account of some peculiarties in it It was to be in neutre when at the end of some compound words The sage had observed this and bearing it in mind recorded the fact in his Sutra His acquaintance with and repeated reference to such matters of Western India leads one to think of him as a native of that part of the country The न्यासकार and others called him शालातुरीय connected with the country शलातुर which was in the modern district of Peshwar in the N W Frontier province of British India Panini's ancestors lived there The Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Thsang even speaks of शलातुर as the birthplace, and also of a statue having been erected there, of the Grammarian But the Indian Scholars derive शालातुरीय in connection with his अभिजन (the residence of his ancestors) and not in connection with his birth place or निवास (i e his own residence) शलातुरो नाम ग्राम'। सोऽभिजनोऽस्यास्तीति शालातुरीयः पाणिनिः।

The sage is called दाक्षीपुत्र and so his mother was a दाक्षी। दक्ष is therefore one of his maternal ancestors There had been one पणिन् among his paternal forefathers The grandson or any subsequent successor of पणिन् was पाणिन। पाणिनि was either the great-grandson or any later progeny of this पाणिन। This is found from the etymology of the word पाणिनि as it is derived with the affix इञ् applied to the term पाणिन, in the grammatical sense of युवन्।

There is a statement in the पञ्चतन्त्र—"सिंहो व्याकरणस्य कर्तुरहरत प्राणान् प्रियान् पाणिनेः" and it may or many not be true There are 3996 Sutras in all in the अष्टाध्यायी।

"त्रीणि सूत्रसहस्राणि तथा नव शतानि च।
षण्णवतिश्च सूत्राणां पाणिनिः कृतवान् स्वयम॥ १॥

By the end of the 8th century A D a Sanskrit Poem named the जाम्बवतीजयकाव्य or the जाम्बवतीविजयकाव्य was composed by a writer who was clever enough in palming his book off under the name of पाणिनि It was राजशेखर the dramatist, preceptor to महेन्द्रपाल king of Kanoj (AD 890—910 AD), who seems to have given much prominence to an assertion that Panini had been the author of this काव्य Hence probably much value was set on and some undue regard paid to it, by a few classical authors such as शरणदेव, पुरुषोत्तम, &cc The sage could, in fact, have no connexion with this book which was undoubtedly a later Production

(2) व्याडि।

No grammarian is heard of in the interval between पाणिनि and कात्यायन, if व्याडि be not such a one कात्यायन cites the authority of व्याडि in a वार्त्तिक of his attached to I 2 64 viz द्रव्याभिधान व्याडि'—which is explained by पतञ्जलि as द्रव्याभिधानं व्याडिराचार्यो न्याय्यं मन्यते। To the Sutra आचार्योपसर्जनश्चान्तेवासी (६.२.३६), पतञ्जलि cites the illustration आपिशलपाणिनीयव्याडीयगौतमीयाः। कुणि and चूर्णि are named as prior to पतञ्जलि। But how they are connected with कात्यायन in *time* is not known भर्तृहरि says in his वाक्यपदीय (6) that there was a grammatical work called संग्रह। When it was obsolete, पतञ्जलि prepared his Great Commentary—the महाभाष्य—which was the संग्रहप्रतिकञ्चुक, that is, the substance or essence of the संग्रह। But the महाभाष्य deals chiefly with the Vartikas by कात्यायन and the संग्रह had probably to do nothing with them So the महाभाष्य is called the संग्रहप्रतिकञ्चुक, probably because it had adopted and incorporated the grammatical tenets and principles set down in the संग्रह। व्याडि is also supposed to have collected together all परिभाषा or the Sutras of the antepanini grammarians, which have been tacitly adopted as authoritative by the commentators and the followers of the अष्टाध्यायी।

पतञ्जलि names one दाक्षायण as the author of the संग्रह। To illustrate the Sutra 2 3 26, he says—"शोभना खलु दाक्षायणस्य संग्रहस्य कृतिः। शोभना खलु दाक्षायणेन संग्रहस्य कृतिः।' In 4 2 60, he puts वार्त्तिकसूत्रिक (7) सांग्रहसूत्रिक, सवार्त्तिकः, ससंग्रहः। In the पस्पशा (or the commencing chapter of the महाभाष्य) is the passage संग्रह एतत् प्राधान्येन परीक्षितम् and again संग्रहे तावत् कार्य्यप्रतिद्वन्द्विभावान् मन्यामहे नित्यपर्य्यायवाचिनो ग्रहणमिति। Besides, he leads us to a fact that the author of the संग्रह was a kinsman to Panini In the भाष्य of I 2 20 and again of VII I 27 standa the Stanza—

सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः।
एकदेशविकारे तु नित्यत्वमुपजायते ॥ १ ॥

from which Panini's mother is found to be a दाक्षी, a relation to दक्ष। दाक्षी is derived from दाक्षि by ङीष् under इतो मनुष्यजातेः (4 I 95) दाक्षि again comes from दक्ष by the patronymic इञ् (4 I 95) So दाक्षि is a descendant of दक्ष and co eval with दाक्षी Now दाक्षायण is a युवा descendant of दाक्षि by यञिञोश्च (4 I 101) In Sanskrit grammar, a युवा descendant is either a great grandson or any of *his*

---

(6) प्रायेण सङ्क्षेपरुचीनल्पविद्यापरिग्रहान्। सम्प्राप्य वैयाकरणान् संग्रहेऽस्तमुपागते ॥ १
कृतेऽथ पतञ्जलिना गुरुणा तीर्थदर्शिना। सर्वेषां न्यायबीजानां महाभाष्ये निबन्धने ॥ २ ॥
अलब्धगाधे गाम्भीर्यादुत्तान इव सौष्ठवात्। तस्मिन्नकृतबुद्धीनां नैवावास्थित निश्चय ॥ ३ ॥
वैजिसौभवहर्य्यक्षैः शुष्कतर्कानुसारिभि। आर्षे विप्लाविते ग्रन्थे संग्रहप्रतिकञ्चुके ॥ ४ ॥
य पतञ्जलिशिष्येभ्यो भ्रष्टो व्याकरणागम। काले स दाक्षिणात्येषु ग्रन्थमात्रे व्यवस्थित ॥ ५ ॥
(वाक्यपदीय द्वितीयकाण्ड, श्लोक 484 488)

(7) Another reading here is वार्त्तिसूत्रिक from the base वार्त्तिसूत्र।

- ndants So a दाक्षायण cannot but be at least *three* generations later than दाक्षि। Thus the distance in time between दाक्षीपुत्र (or पाणिनि) and दाक्षायण can not be less than at least two generations

Now पुण्यराज (8) a commentator of the वाक्यपदीय asserts, in explaining the stanzas प्रायेण सङ्क्षेपरुचीन् &c quoted above, that "इह पुरा पाणिनीयेऽस्मिन् व्याकरणे व्याड्युपरचितं ग्रन्थलक्षपरिमाणं सङ्ग्रहाभिधानं निबन्धनमासीत्। तच्च कालवशात् सुकुमारबुद्धीन् वैयाकरणान् प्राप्याल्पमुपागतम्।" So, if व्याडि be the author of the सङ्ग्रह, he is a दाक्षायण।

The सङ्ग्रह is also mentioned in the काशिका in 4 2 60 viz —साङ्ग्रहसूत्रिक: and ससंग्रह and again in VII 3 76 ससङ्ग्रह व्याकरणमधीयते। In 2 4 21 and in 6 2 14 is व्याड्युपज्ञं दुष्करणम। श्रीपतिदत्त the writer of the कातन्त्रपरिशिष्ट, who had flourished in the 13th century A D also refers to the सङ्ग्रह and remarks सङ्ग्रहकारोऽप्याह &c

As to the inclusion of व्याडि in the छात्र्यादि (6 2 48) गहादि (4 2 66) and क्रौड्यादि (4 1 80) गण, it is to be noticed that the groups of words originally fixed, had been augmented with later additions to them by other grammarians This probably led जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to observe in VII 4 3 प्रतिपादित हि पूर्व गणकार पाणिनि नं भवतीति। तथा चान्यो हि गणकार। अन्यो हि सूत्रकार।" Says also कैयट I 1 34, 'अभियुक्ता गणान् पठन्ति. . .। त्यदादीनि पठित्वा (सर्वादि) गणे केचित् पूर्वादीनि पठितानि।'

Besides, व्याडि being a descendant of व्यड given in the स्वागतादिगण (7 3 7), may as well be any member of the family other than the author of the सङ्ग्रह Taking व्याडि as the author of the सङ्ग्रह and as referred to by कात्यायन in his वार्त्तिक as stated above, he might be living in 450 B C

(3) कात्यायन।

According to the कथासरित्सागर, कात्यायन was a contemporary to the king Nanda of Magadha, by ousting whom the मौर्य्य king चन्द्रगुप्त set up his own reign there in about 321 B C कात्यायन wrote a critique on the अष्टाध्यायी, containing short epigramatic statements called the Vartikas He often assigned new meanings to words cited by पाणिनि in different senses and advocated such alterations by his Vartikas such as यवनाल्लिप्याम (4 1 49) पथ्यध्यायन्यायविहारमनुष्यहस्तिषु (4 2 129), &c So the interval between पाणिनि and कात्यायन was long enough Otherwise such changes in a language cannot be so rapid He lived probably in 350, B C That कात्यायन was not a contemporary of Panini appears to be almost certain Our attention is arrested by his veneration for the sage This is evident from such of his Vartikas as त्रिविद्यासिगुणेन च यत् सचते तदकीर्त्तित माचरित कविना (1 4 51 वार्त्तिक), तदमल्पमतेर्वचनं स्मरत (1 4 51 तृतीय वार्त्तिक), स्मरन्ति कर्तुर्वचनात् मनीषिण: (6 4 110, वार्त्तिक) च भगवान् कृतवांस्तदर्थं तेन भवेदिटि वो

---

(8) पुण्यराज finishes his commentary with शशाङ्कशिष्यात्कुलितद वाक्यकाण्डं समासत'। पुण्यराजेन तथोक्ता सङ्गति कारिकाश्रिता ॥ १ ॥ गुरवे भर्त्तृहरये शब्दब्रह्मविदे नम'। सर्वसिद्धान्त सन्दोहसाराम्रृतमयाय च ॥ २ ॥ So some चान्द्र grammarian helped him in preparing his book If भर्त्तृहरि were really his preceptor, he lived in the 7th century A D

विभिन्नवत्ति' (६।४।२१, वार्त्तिक), भगवत पाणिनेः सिद्धम् (८।४ ६८, वार्तिक)। In these statements कात्यायन mentions पाणिनि as कवि (poet or of retentive memory, मेधावी), अनल्पमति (i e of much intelligence, wise), कर्त्ता (master) भगवान् (sage] Here the term भगवत् at least is too high and respectful This clearly shows Panini's priority to Katyayana Otherwise is it not unusual and strange to apply भगवान् or such an appellation of respect to a rival who is a contemporary or a neighbour ? They may be applied, if applied at all by co eval persons, at most to a very old personage of established fame and of some extraordinary power or ability Besides the words स्मरन्ति and स्मरत in two of those above quoted Vartikas are, I think, enough to shake out such a likelihood in the present case Says कात्यायन, तदनल्पमते वचन स्मरत Recollect the word of that wise man. Again he says स्मरन्ति कर्त्तवचनान्मनाषिण i e the intelligent *remember* on account of the word of the master Remembering surely cannot but relate to something which had been once very well known and now disappeared from memory. This, I think, strongly decides the earlier existence of पाणिनि and Katyayana's posteriority

कात्यायन names व्याडि, वाजप्यायन and पौष्करसादि in his vartikas So they could not be posterior to him He was a resident of the Deccan पतञ्जलि taunted him with the remark प्रियतद्धिता दाक्षिणात्या, that is, the people of the Deccan are fond of the तद्धित affixes The occasion for this taunt was that instead of stating लोके वेदे च, कात्यायन had used लौकिकवैदिकेषु in the वार्त्तिक—"अनुकरण शिष्टाशिष्टप्रतिषिद्धेषु यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु"। Yet he honoured कात्यायन elsewhere by calling him भगवान्' कात्य —

"प्रोवाच भगवान कात्य स्तेनासिद्धिर्यणस्तु ते ।
आत को लिट् नैड पूर्वं सिद्ध आद्रूस्तया सति ॥ १ ॥" (भाष्य 3 2 3)

Tradition gives another name to कात्यायन It is वररुचि The illustration वाररुच काव्यम in the भाष्य of 4 3 103 also refers to a वररुचि But it is uncertain if the grammarian कात्यायन is identical with the poet वररुचि Nor is it acknowledged by all that the वार्त्तिककार is the same personage who is the author of either any one or more of the following viz, अनुक्रमणिका, प्रातिशाख्य, संहिता or other such works connected with the name of कात्यायन।

Many vartikas are in poetry Only a few of them are assigned to कात्यायन and recorded in the वार्त्तिकपाठ। जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, कैयट and नागोजिभट्ट often speak of some श्लोकवार्त्तिककार other than कात्यायन In the भाष्यप्रदीप of 2 4 36, कैयट speaks of one व्याघ्रभूति to whom is ascribed the श्लोकवार्त्तिक—

लग्धिविधिर्ल्यपि यत तदकस्मादसिद्धिमदस्ति कितीति विधानात् ।
हिप्रभृतीस्तु सदा बहिरङ्गो ल्यब् भवतीति कृत तदु विद्धि ॥ १ ॥

As this stanza is quoted in the महाभाष्य (2 4 36) व्याघ्रभूति is found to be prior to पतञ्जलि The अनिट् कारिकाs, eleven in number, enumerating (9) the अनिट्

(9) These are quoted in 7 2 10 of the काशिका।

roots, also belong to व्याघ्रभूति There is another श्लोकवार्त्तिक quoted in 8 2 1 in the काशिका Viz —

शुष्किका शुष्कजङ्घा च क्षामिमानौजढत तथा ।
मतौ वत्से भाला जगुत्व गुडलिण्मान् निदर्शनम् ॥ १ ॥

which is known as composed by one व्याघ्रपात् । It is therefore called the वैयाघ्रपद्यवार्त्तिक ।

(4) कुणि ।

We find the name of this grammarian in the भाष्यप्रदीप by कैयट and in the पदमञ्जरी by हरदत्तमिश्र । From their reference, it is found that कुणि was prior to पतञ्जलि, for कैयट observes that पतञ्जलि adopted, in the महाभाष्य, Kuni's explanation of I 1 75 "कुणिना प्राग्ग्रहणमाचार्य्यनिर्देशार्थं व्यवस्थितविभाषार्थञ्चेति व्याख्यातम् । अन्येन तु प्राग्ग्रहणं देशविशेषणं व्याख्यातम् । भाष्यकारस्तु कुणिदर्शनमाशिश्रियत ।"—(कैयट १।१।७५) । In annotating on the काशिका stanza वृत्तौ भाष्ये तथा धातुनामपारायणादिषु &c says हरदत्त—"सूत्रार्थप्रधानो ग्रन्थो वृत्तिः । सा चेह पाणिनिप्रणीतानां सूत्राणां कुणिप्रभृतिभि राचार्य्यैर्विरचितं विवरणम् ।" Probability is strong enough that कुणि and चूर्णि to be spoken of presently, are identical

(5) चूर्णि ।

The काशिका begins with वृत्तौ भाष्ये तथा धातुनामपारायणादिषु The term वृत्ति here precedes the word भाष्य, from which the existence of an earlier work of that name on पाणिनि than the महाभाष्य, is inferred The संग्रह was one such, as also was the कुणिवृत्ति । जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि in explaining the verse says—"वृत्तिः पाणिनिप्रणीतानां सूत्राणां विवरणं चूल्लिभट्टिनल्लूरादिविरचितम्" । This reading is from the Poona Deccan college MS The MS in Bengali characters, which is in the Varendra Research Society of Rajshahi, Bengal, has—वृत्ति पाणिनिप्रणीतानां सूत्राणां विवरणं चुन्निभट्टिनिर्लूरादिविरचितम् ।" मैत्रेयरक्षित in his तन्त्रप्रदीप writes on 8 3 97—"सव्येष्ठा इति । सारथिवचनोऽयम् । अत्र चूल्लिभट्टिस्तावपि तत्पुरुषे कृति बहुलमित्यलुग् इष्यते ।" श्रीपतिदत्त of the कातन्त्रपरिशिष्ट speaks of the निर्लूरवृत्ति, Commenting on the चर्करीत roots, says he,—निर्लूरवृत्तौ चोक्तं भाषायामपि यङ्लुगस्तीति So the न्यासकार seems to refer to two works चूल्लिभट्टिवृत्ति and नल्लूरवृत्ति or निर्लूरवृत्ति This may induce one to think चूर्णि and चूल्लि of चूल्लिभट्टि as the same It will presently be stated that the work by चूर्णि was commented on by भर्तृहरि and चूल्लिभट्टिवृत्ति might be this joint work

Regarding चूर्णि, a very powerful evidence comes from the Chinese source Itsing, the Chinese traveller, who had been in India nineteen years from 671 A D to 691 A D refers to चूर्णि Says he—"Next there is a commentary on the वृत्तिसूत्र (10) entitled *Churni* It is a work of the learned पतञ्जलि This

(10) What was this वृत्तिसूत्र ? Was it another commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी ? Who then was its author ? That the name वृत्तिसूत्र for a grammatical book was recognised even in ancient time, is found from the variant वार्त्तिसूत्रिक for वार्त्तिकसूत्रिक in the महाभाष्य in 4 2 60

again cites the former Sutras (Panini's) explaining the obscure points and analysing the principles contained in it and it illustrates the latter commentary (the Virti, that is, the काशिकावृत्ति) clearing up many difficulties Advanced scholars learn it in three years". "Next there is the भर्तृहरिशास्त्र This is the commentary of the foregoing चूर्णि and is the work of a great scholar भर्तृहरि।" (11)

चूर्णि is referred to by श्रीपतिदत्त In his कालप्रकरण is the statement "मतमेतच् चूर्णि-रप्यनुगृह्णाति and again "सर्वागावयवव्यञ्जनस्य सजातीयस्यैकस्येवानेकस्योच्चारणमिष्ट इति चूर्णि'।" जगदीशभट्टाचार्य of the शब्दशक्तिप्रकाशिका and some other modern writers too speak of a grammatical scholiast चूर्णि। चूर्णि means something powdered So the scholium is the चूर्णि Hence its author is variously called चूर्णि, चूर्णिकृत or चूर्णिकार According to Itsing, पतञ्जलि himself is this चूर्णि or चूर्णिकृत् Some Indians too hold this view Now the work by चूर्णि and its commentary by भर्तृहरि narrated by I tsing, might be the चूर्णिभट्टिवृत्ति in tanced by the न्यासकार and the latter was composed earlier than the काशिका On the other hand if चूर्णि had really been a scholiast other than पतञ्जलि, he might be identical with कुणि mentioned by कैयट and हरदत्त।

Now one thing is to be marked If पतञ्जलि were the author of the चूर्णि, that is, of a scholium on पाणिनि, it was different from the महाभाष्य For the महाभाष्य deals with the Vartikas by कात्यायन and not with Panini's aphorisms directly and generally Hence that Scholium is no longer extant कुणिवृत्ति (or चूर्णि वृत्ति) too is now defunct There is however much confu ion about चूर्णि No satisfactory proofs are available at present to come to a decisive conclusion on the point Further information is absolutely required to clear the obscurity

(6) पतञ्जलि।

The Great Commentary, that is the महाभाष्य, is a work by पतञ्जलि। He defends Panini in it from the ill conceived and often erroneous attacks by कात्यायन, preferred in his Vartikas To a वार्त्तिक, (जितपर्य्यायवचनस्यैव राजाद्यर्थम्) in I 1 68, पतञ्जलि puts two illustrations पुष्प (ष्य) मित्रसभा। चन्द्रगुप्तसभा। Now चन्द्रगुप्त founded the मौर्य्य dynasty of Magadha in about 321 B C. Another चन्द्रगुप्त the first of the Gupta dynasty, was living in 320 A D It will be found presently that this second चन्द्रगुप्त could not have been intended by पतञ्जलि in supplying the name of a king in the illustration of the aforesaid वार्त्तिक। पुष्पमित्र (or पुष्यमित्र) was the founder of the Sunga dynasty in Magadha He usurped the throne in about 183 B C by assassinating बृहद्रथ the last मौर्य्य king whose commander in-chief he had been पतञ्जलि again cites the name of पुष्प (ष्य) मित्र in the भाष्य of

(11) A record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and Maloy Archipelago (A D 671 to A D, 695) by Itsing Translated by J, Takukusu B, A Ph D Clarendon press, Oxford, 1896

III 1 26, पुष्यमित्रो यजते याजका याजयन्तीति। तत्र भवितव्य पुष्यमित्रो याजयते याजका याजयन्तीति and again of III ii 123 "इह पुष्य (ष्य) मित्र याजयाम।" It is known from the Drama मालविकाग्निमित्र by कालिदास that this king performed the अश्वमेध ceremony in which he appointed his grandson वसुमित्र to protect the sacred horse Most likely पतञ्जलि witnessed this ceremony Nay, remembering his statemant इह पुष्यमित्र याजयाम, it may be that he officiated in it as a priest This king died in about 148 B C and was succeeded by his son अग्निमित्र। The illustrations अरुणद् यवन साकेतम्। अरुणद् यवनो माध्यमिकाम् given for the वार्त्तिक in the Sutra III ii 111, determine his age from the three conditions laid down in it, viz —परोक्षे च लोकविज्ञाते प्रयोक्तुर्दर्शनविषये। Menander, called by the Buddhists Milinda, a relation to the Bactrian king Eucratides and himself of Greek origin, was a king of the Punjab and Kabul He beseiged साकेत (Oude) and माध्यमिका in 155 B C माध्यमिका here indicates a country It is Nagari, near Chitore in Rajputana It is also mentioned in the बृहत्संहिता,—"मरुवत्सघोषयामुनसारस्वतमाध्यमिका" (14/2) Now the प्रयोक्ता (speaker) of those two illustrations is पतञ्जलि himself The event was notorious enough (लोकविज्ञात) It was out of his sight, though capable of being viewed by him (12) Hence पतञ्जलि was living in 155 B C

The statement "मौर्यैर्हिरण्यार्थिभिरर्चाः प्रकल्पिता। भवेत्। तासु न स्यात्।" in the भाष्य of V iii 99, may also indicate, if the passage be not corrupted in transcription or transmission, the impecunious conditions of the last मौर्य्य kings and their kinsmen who had flourished before पतञ्जलि। The example जालूकाश्लोका in the भाष्य of IV iii 101, refers probably to a very remote period, as we know from the राजतरङ्गिणी that one जालूक had been a king of काश्मीर in about 600 B C The statement एकाकिभि क्षुद्रकैर्जितम् occurs in the भाष्य of I I 31 and of 5 3 52 The क्षुद्रक people were defeated by Alexander the Great, but he could not annihilate them

पतञ्जलि names in the महाभाष्य other authors such as दाक्षायण, गोनर्दीय, गोणिकापुत्र, वार्ष्यायणि, काशकृत्स्न, कुणरवाडव, and सौर्य्यभगवान् (13) Different schools of Grammarians or Scholars, such as भारद्वाजीया:, क्रोष्टीया:, सौनागा, and सात्यमुग्रिराणायनीया: are also mentioned by him In the भाष्य of III ii 108, he supplies the illustration उपसेदिवान् कौत्स: पाणिनिम्। This shews that कौत्स was rather some personage of the time Otherwise why his approach to the great Grammarian,

---

(12) In imitation, in the चान्द्रव्याकरण, चन्द्रगोमी puts the illustration अजयद् गुप्तो हूणानिति for his Sutra based upon the वार्त्तिक परोक्षे च लोकविज्ञाते प्रयोक्तुर्दर्शनविषये (3 2 111). This refers, it is said, to Skanda Gupta's conquest over the Huns in 465 A D If so चन्द्राचार्य्य lived likely in 465 A D But others assert that चन्द्र was a contemporary to अभिमन्यु who riegned over काश्मीर in the first Century B C

(13) सौर्य्य was the name of a city and a certain *Savant* (आचार्य्य) of it, is called सौर्य्यभगवान् by पतञ्जलि।

should be so recorded ? In 3 3 3 is वैयाकरणानाञ्च शाकटायन आह धातुजं नामेति । Again in 3 2 15 is वैयाकरणाना शाकटायनो रथमार्गे आसीन शकटसार्थ यान्तमोपलेभे ।

We find the statement "उभयथा गोणिकापुत्र" in the भाष्य of I 1 15, नागोजिभट्ट takes गोणिका as the name of Patanjali's mother गोनर्द्दीय occurs repeatedly viz — in the भाष्य of I 1 2, of 1 1 29, of II 1 92 of III 1 92 and again of VII 2 101 The country गोनर्द identified with the modern Gonda in Oude, belonged to the 'Eastern Province" known as such by the Grammarians of the time (14) and therefore जयादित्य forms an illustration with it as गोनर्द्दीय for I 1 75 which he understood to concern the प्राग्देश, or the "Eastern Province"

Now in the भाष्य of 1 1 21, stands the passage गोनर्द्दीयस्त्वाह सत्यमेतत् सति त्वन्यस्मिन्निति and कैयट paraphrases it भाष्यकारस्त्वाह सति त्वन्यस्मिन्निति । Again in the भाष्य of I 1 29 is गोनर्द्दीय स्त्वाह अकच्स्वरौ तु कर्त्तव्यौ प्रत्यङ्ग मुक्तसंशयौ । त्वकत्पितृक मकत्पितृक इत्येव भवितव्यमिति । On this says कैयट—"गोनर्द्दीयस्त्वाहेति । सूत्रप्रत्याख्यानमेतत् । यथोत्तर हि मुनित्रयस्य प्रामाण्यम् ।" So कैयट takes पतञ्जलि and गोनर्द्दीय as one and the same person

But in the कामसूत्र by वात्स्यायन, गोनर्द्दीय and गोणिकापुत्र are separately named as two persons and as certain authorities holding different views on a matter Now it is said that वात्स्यायन, कौटिल्य, चाणक्य, मल्लनाग and विष्णुगुप्त (15) are the several names of one and the same person Hence if वात्स्यायन were the preceptor of चन्द्रगुप्त the मौर्य्य, गोनर्द्दीय or गोणिकापुत्र cannot be identical with पतञ्जलि । So, to support कैयट and नागोजि, गोनर्द्दीय and गोणिकापुत्र of the कामसूत्र are taken to be as some other authors.

The tradition is that the महाभाष्य became for some time obsolete It was the king अभिमन्यु of काश्मीर, who braught, during the first century B C, the scholars from other provinces and set up its study in his own kingdom

देशान्तरादागमय्य व्याचक्षाणान् क्षमापतिः ।
प्रावर्त्तयत विच्छिन्नं महाभाष्यं स्वमण्डले ॥ १ ॥ (राजतरङ्गिणी 4 487)

The study of the महाभाष्य was again forsaken by the scholars misled by the sophists बैजि, सौभव, हर्य्यक्ष &c The causes thereof are recounted by भर्त्तृहरि in the stanzas beginning with प्रायेण सक्षेपरुचीन् &c quoted before It is said that only one single MS of it once existed in the whole of India —Adds भर्त्तृहरि—

---

(14) प्रागुदञ्चौ विभजते हंस क्षीरोदके यथा ।
विदुषा शब्दसिद्ध्यर्थं सा न पातु शरावती ॥ १ ॥

(15) In the Drama मुद्राराक्षस by विशाखदत्त, चाणक्य, कौटिल्य and विष्णुगुप्त are found to be the names of one and the same person नवनन्दान् द्विजः कश्चित् सपुत्रानुद्धरिष्यतीति श्रीमद्भागवत पद्यव्याख्याने द्विज कौटिल्यवात्स्यायनादिपर्य्याय श्चाणक्य इति श्रीधरस्वामी ।

य पतञ्जलि शिष्येभ्यो भ्रष्टो व्याकरणागमः।
काले स दाक्षिणात्येषु ग्रन्थमात्रे व्यवस्थित ॥
पर्वतादागम लब्ध्वा भाष्यबीजानुसारिभि ।
स नीतो बहुशाखत्व चन्द्राचार्य्यादिभिः पुन ॥ २ ॥
न्यायप्रस्थानमार्गांस्तानभ्यस्य स्वञ्च दर्शनम्।
प्रणीतो गुरुणास्माक मयमागमसग्रह ॥ ३ ॥

This is also confirmed by the राजतरङ्गिणी—

चन्द्राचार्य्यादिभिर्लब्ध्वादेश तस्मात् तदागमम् ।
प्रवर्त्तित महाभाष्य स्वञ्च व्याकरणं मह्त ॥ १ ॥

if the Grammarian चन्द्र d d really live during the reign of Abhimanyu, king of Kasmira Here तस्मात् evidently means from Abhimanyu So according to some चन्द्राचार्य्य and अभिमन्यु are co eval But others assert that चन्द्राचार्य्य or चन्द्रगोमिन, the author of the चान्द्रव्याकरण, lived in 465 A D It is inferred from an example—अजयद् गुप्तो हूणान्—given by him in his grammar, in imitation of अरुणद् यवनः साकेतम् cited by पतञ्जलि to examplify a वार्त्तिक in 3 2 111 Another Grammarian वसुरात is said to have been a pupil of चन्द्रगोमिन् in 480 A D Some take वसुरात as the preceptor of भर्तृहरि If so, he might have got this pupil in his very old age, as भर्तृहरि died in 651 A D So the study of the महाभाष्य seems to have been again current since the 5th century A D

Poetical passages in large number are found in the महाभाष्य। एति जीवन्तमानन्दो नर वर्षशतादपि is in 3 1 67 It occurs also in the रामायण (Book V 36) The couplet in 6 1 84

ऊर्ध्वं प्राणा व्युत्क्रामन्ति यून. स्थविर आयति।
प्रत्युत्थानाभिवादाभ्या पुनस्तान् प्रतिपद्यते ॥ १ ॥

Is found in the मनुसहिता। काल पचति भूतानि काल सहरति प्रजा in 3 3 167 is in the हारीतसहिता and the महाभारत। अहरहर्नयमानो गामश्व पुरुष पशुम्। वैवस्वतो न तृप्यति सुरया इव दुर्मदी in 2 2 29 is in the महाभारत too In 2 3 35 is

दूरादावसथान्मूत्र दूरात् पादावसेचनम्।
दूराच्च भाव्य दस्युभ्यो दूराच्च कुपिताद गुरोः ॥ १ ॥

In 2 2 29 is उपासात स्थूलसिक्त तूष्णीङ्गङ्ग महाह्रदम्।
द्रोणच्छेदशको गन्तु मा त्वा ताता क्रताक्रते ॥ १ ॥

In 1 4 3 is यस्मिन् दश सहस्राणि पुत्रे जाते गवा ददौ।
ब्राह्मणेभ्य प्रियाख्येभ्य सोऽयमुञ्छेन जीवति ॥ १ ॥

In 1 3 25 we get बहूनामप्यचित्तानामेको भवति चित्तवान्।
पश्य वानरसैन्येऽस्मिन् यदर्कमुपतिष्ठते ॥ १ ॥
मैव मस्था सचित्तोऽयमेषोऽपि हि यथा वयम्।
एतदप्यस्य कापेय यदर्कमुपतिष्ठति ॥ २ ॥

In 4 1 93 is — कुतश्चरति मायूरिः केन कापिञ्जलिं कृश ।
आह्वेयेन च दृष्टस्य पाञ्जिः सुतसमो मत ॥ १ ।

In 4 1 48 is — त्रीणि यस्यावदातानि विद्या योनिश्च कर्म च।
एतच्छिवे विजानीहि ब्राह्मणाग्रस्य लक्षणम् ॥ १ ॥

In 2 3 13 — वाताय कपिला विद्युदातपायातिलोहिनी।
कृष्णा सर्व्वविनाशाय दुर्भिक्षाय सिता भवेत् ॥ १ ॥

In 2 3 36 — चर्मणि द्वीपिनं हन्ति दन्तयो र्हन्ति कुञ्जरम् ।
केशेषु चमरीं हन्ति सीम्नि पुष्कलको हत ॥ १ ॥

In 3 1 48 — नाकमिष्टसुखं यान्ति सुयुक्तैर्वडवारथैः ।
अथ पत्काषिणो यान्ति येऽचीकमतभाषिणः ॥ १ ॥

In 5 1 115 — तपः श्रुतञ्च योनिश्च एतद् ब्राह्मणकारकम् ।
तप श्रुताभ्यां यो हीनो जातिब्राह्मण एव स ॥ १ ॥

In 8 1 8 is — सामृते पाणिभिर्घ्नन्ति गुरवो न विषोक्षितैः ।
लालनाश्रयिणो दोषा स्ताडनाश्रयिणो गुणा ॥ १ ॥

Many other verses such as वरतनु सम्प्रवदन्ति कुक्कुटा., असिद्वितीयोऽनुससार पाण्डव, महोपालवचः श्रुत्वा जुघुषु पुष्पमाणवाः सङ्कर्षणद्वितीयस्य बलं कृष्णस्य वर्द्धताम् &c are there This shows that Sanskrit literature was then Sufficiently developed In the भाष्य of 3 3. 167 and elsewhere (specially in the पस्पशा) many other stanzas, current then as adages, are to be found Dramatic representations and the public recitations of ancient texts are also hinted in the भाष्य of III 1 26 by ये तावदेते शोभिका नाम, एते प्रत्यक्ष कंसं घातयन्ति प्रत्यक्षञ्च बलिं बन्धयन्तीति । . ग्रन्थिकेषु कथं यत्र शब्दग्रन्थनमात्रं लक्ष्यते ? (16) &c .

(7) भर्तृहरि।

भर्तृहरि is the name of the author or authors of three grammatical works and three didactic poems These are a commentary on the महाभाष्य, the वाक्यपदीय, the भागवृत्ति, the वैराग्यशतक, the नीतिशतक, and the शृङ्गारशतक, Kaiyata in writing his Bhashya Prodeepa often availed of the first with the acknowledgment—

"तथापि हरिबद्धेन सारेण ग्रन्थसेतुना ।
क्रममाणः शनैः पारं तस्य प्राप्तास्मि पङ्गुवत्" ॥ १ ॥

Itsing in a part of his book, makes भर्तृहरि the author of a commentary on पाणिनि—He calls it "pei na", which is surmised by the Japanese translator

(16) शोभिका नाम कंसाद्यनुकारिणो नटाना व्याख्यानोपाध्याया ।
ग्रन्थिकेष्विति कथकेष्वित्यर्थ इति कैयट' ।

(Mr J Takukusu) to be the "Veda Vritti" or 'वेडावृत्ति" (17) Says I tsing—"A person who has studied so far as this book, is said to have mastered Grammatical Science" Now this "Pei na' is probably the भागवृत्ति which was a commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी The भागवृत्ति is referred to by हरदत्त, मैत्रेयरचित, पुरुषोत्तमदेव, शरणदेव, श्रीपतिदत्त, माधव (सायनाचार्य्य), भट्टोजि and others As to its authorship, the following statement is found in the तन्त्रप्रदीप (a commentary on the काशिका and the न्यास, perhaps also called the वृत्तिप्रदीप) by मैत्रेय रचित on the Sutra VIII iii 21-viz —"भर्त्तृहरिणा चास्य नित्यायतैवोक्ता। तथाच भागवृत्तिकृता प्रत्युदाहरणमुपन्यस्त तन्त्रे उत तन्तयुतमिति। वामनोऽपि लोपिनैवोदाहरणमुक्तवान्।"—शरणदेव says in his दुर्घटवृत्ति on the Sutra VIII iii 37—"उपराम उदयाम इत्येव भवतीति भर्त्तृहरिणा भागवृत्तिकृता चोक्तम्।" सृष्टिधराचार्य्य the author of the भाषावृत्त्यर्थविवृति, a commentary on the भाषावृत्ति by पुरुषोत्तमदेव, remarks in the end of his book—"भागवृत्ति-भर्त्तृहरिणा विरचिता श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रादिष्टा।" This श्रीधरसेन might be the third king of that name of वलभी, whose reign terminated in about 629 A D Or it might be an error on the part of सृष्टिधर, arising from the belief entertained by some, that the poet of the भट्टिकाव्य and the Grammarian भर्त्तृहरि are identical.—I tsing also speaks of the वाक्यपदीय by भर्त्तृहरि and gives 651 A D as the year of his death

Now the author of the भट्टिकाव्य observes काव्यमिदं विहितं मया वलभ्यां श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रपालितायाम्।" There is a variant here viz श्रीधरसूनुनरेन्द्रपालितायाम्। In Dandin's दशकुमारचरित is the passage अस्ति सौराष्ट्रेषु वलभी नाम नगरी, It is indentified with the modern country Wala in Kath awar Sridhar en I, King of वलभी was succeeded by his brother द्रोणसिंह in 502 A D Another Dharasena or Sridharasen II reigned over वलभी in 517 A D Next, Sridhara-Sena III reigned there till 629 A D The poet भट्टि had likely one of these Dharasenas as his patron That he is different from भर्त्तृहरि, the author of the भागवृत्ति and is anterior to the latter, is clear enough, as the grammarian finds fault with the poet sometimes and sometimes justifies him On आतृध्व मा रघूत्तमम् in the भट्टिकाव्य, the भागवृत्ति asserts प्रमाद एवायम् ((18)। Again on प्राक् केकयीतो भरतस्ततोऽभूत् says भागवृत्ति—"शार्ङ्गरवाद यञो ङीनिति ङीन् (19)।

Regarding the author of the three Satakas named above, there is a tradition that, mortified at his wife's infidelity, he renounced the world and became a mendicant I tsing alludes to and admires a similar event in the life of the Grammarian भर्त्तृहरि who had exchanged his riches for the life of a devotee This cannot, of course, be sufficient for asserting that the writer of

---

(17) May not the "Veda Vritti" as well be a corruption of the word भिन्नवृत्ति वा भेदवृत्ति ie भागवृत्ति?

(18) Quoted by भट्टोजि in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी on the Sutra आङो यमहन (१।३।२८)।

(19) Quoted by पुरुषोत्तमदेव in the भाषावृत्ति on the Sutra न प्राच्यभर्गादियौधेयादिभ्यः (४।१।१७८)।

the नीतिशतक and वैराग्यशतक is the same personage as the author of the वाक्यपदीय or the भागवृत्ति Besides, the Satakas are more or less eclectic in which 'stanzas of later writers even, are found incorporated

According to the न्यासकार, there was a चूल्लिभट्टिवृत्ति on the अष्टाध्यायी and it had been composed earlier than the काशिका On the other hand, I tsing's assertion that भर्तृहरि had written a commentary on the चूर्णि, is well known चूर्णि might have been changed to चूल्लि, चुल्लि or चून्नि through provincialism or manipulations of the scribes —In the काशिका, a वृत्ति is referred to in VIII iii 48 viz —"भाष्ये वृत्तौ च नित्य समासेऽनुत्तरपदस्थस्येत्यत्र (8 3 45) परमसर्पि कुण्डिकेत्येतदेव प्रत्युदाहरणम् ।" Most likely this वृत्ति is the भागवृत्ति The order in which it is stated seems to make it a later work than the महाभाष्य According to I tsing, Bhatrihari's death took place ten years earlier than Jayaditya's So the latter might easily consult the former's work The term वृत्ति in the opening line वृत्तौ भाष्ये तथा धातुनामपारायणादिषु of the काशिका, may be a work prior in time to the महाभाष्य and different from the वृत्ति mentioned in VIII iii 48 The one might be the भागवृत्ति by भर्तृहरि and the other चूर्णिवृत्ति or कुणिवृत्ति ।

The word वाक्यपदीय occurs as an example to IV iii 88 in the काशिका, viz —"शब्दार्थसम्बन्धीय प्रकरण वाक्यपदीयम् ।" कैयट also names it, as already stated, and repeatedly quotes from it. The observation that भर्तृहरि lived in about 800 A D goes againt I tsing's asserton This may be true in the case of the poet of the three *satakas*, but not of the grammarian Though the pseudo-vœrtika मणीवादीना प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्य in I i. 11 is rejected by भर्तृहरि and adopted by जयादित्य, there is no inconsistency as to their synchronism As this वार्त्तिक was not given by कात्यायन and पतञ्जलि, भर्तृहरि did not take it in But the Buddhist author either composed it himself or transferred it to his book from some older scholium, thinking इव, and not व, following such words as मणी, दम्पती, &c Other pseudo vartikas, such as यमाचेति वक्तव्यम् in iv. i 85, (20) are also found in the काशिका ।

(8) मल्लूरवृत्ति or निर्लूरवृत्ति ।

Nothing more is known of this treatise than that it is mentioned by the न्यासकार and once quoted by श्रीपतिदत्त in his कातन्त्रपरिशिष्ट । So its author too is now unknown

(9) जयादित्य and वामन ।

These two are the authors of the काशिका । जयादित्य died in 661 A D I tsing describes him as the author of the Sutra Vritti identified with the काशिका । But the Indian scholars take the Kasika as the joint work of two writers

(20) This वार्त्तिक is found exemplified in ancient as well as modern works For instance—यास्येन चाभवन् केशा बाहवो विष्णुतेजसेति देवीमाहात्म्ये । याते चेतसि मापुयाम शतशो याम्या पुनर्यातमा इति कुसुमाञ्जलावाचार्य्य उदयन ।

जयादित्य and वामन। जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि discourses in III i, 33 on a contradiction arising from two opposite statements in III i, 33 and vii i 58 in the काशिका and he attemps to remove it thus —

"नास्ति विरोध। भिन्नकर्तृकत्वात्। इद हि जयादित्यस्य वचनम्। तत् पुनर्वामनस्य। वामनवृत्तौ तु तासिसिचोरिकार उच्चारणार्थो नानुबन्ध पन्यते। तेन विरोधो नाशङ्कनीय। केन पुनरभिसन्धिना जयादित्यस्तासेरिकारस्यानुनासिकलोपप्रतिषेधार्थता कृतवान्? वामनस्तूच्चारणार्थताम्? श्रूयताम्। & "

He again notices a difference of views between the two authors in I i 5,—

'ग्लाजिस्थश्चेत्यत्र (3, 2 13) जयादित्यवृत्तौ ग्रन्थ. श्रुक: कितीत्यत्रापि (7 2 11) जयादित्य वृत्तौ ग्रन्थ । वामनस्य त्वेतत् सर्वमनभिमतम्। तथाहि तस्यैव सूत्रस्य (7 2 11) तद्विरचितायां वृत्तौ ग्रन्थ केचिदत्र द्विककारनिर्देशेन गकारप्रश्लेष वर्णयन्तीति।'

हरदत्त too echoes the statement by the न्यासकार in III i 33 in his पदमञ्जरी— "एव तावत् जयादित्येनासिद्धत्वमाश्रित्य तासेरित्करणमनुनासिकलोपप्रतिषेधार्थमित्युक्तम्। वामनस्तु टिलोपस्य सिद्धत्वादेव नलोपो न भविष्यतीति मन्यमान इटितोरित्यत्र (7 i 58) वक्ष्यति तासिसिचोरिदित्काव्य नास्त्युच्चारणार्थौ निरनुनासिक इकार: पठ्यत इति।"

Again in II ii 17 हरदत्त takes तृच् क्रीडाजीविकयोर्नास्तीति as the opinion of जयादित्य and then says वामनस्त्वके जीविकार्थे (6 2 73) इत्यत्राक इति किम्? रमणीयकर्त्तेति जीविकायां तृच प्रत्युदाहरिष्यति।

भट्टोजि also maintains this joint authorship in his प्रौढमनोरमा in V iv 42 viz —एतच्च सर्व्वं जयादित्यमतेनोक्तम्। वामनस्तु मन्यते जातिशब्देभ्योऽपि भवत्येव Again in the शब्दकौस्तुभ, on I i, 5 he says जयादित्योऽप्येवम्। वामनस्तु न क्वापि गकारप्रश्लेष' कार्य्य इत्याह।

So the काशिका is the joint work of जयादित्य and वामन It is desirable to find out their individual shares in it हरिदीक्षित asserts in his शब्दरत्न on V iv 42 "प्रथमद्वितीयपञ्चमषष्ठा जयादित्यकृतवृत्तय। इतरे वामनकृतवृत्तय इत्यभियुक्ता:।' In Pundit Balshastrin's printed edition of the काशिका, the first four Adhyayas are assigned to जयादित्य and the rest to वामन This view is now generally accepted But the observation by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि quoted above —श्रुक: कितीत्यत्रापि (7 2 19) जयादित्यवृत्तौ ग्रन्थ &c—throws some doubt on it Did जयादित्य write a complete commentary on the काशिका? Besides, it is strange that I-tsing is totally silent about वामन Says he of जयादित्य—

"He was a man of great ability His literary power was very striking He understood things which he had heard once, not requiring to be taught twice It is now nearly thirty years since his death '

I tsing composed his book in 691 A D So Jayaditya's death occurred in 661 A. D Now why within so short a time is Jayaditya's colleague entirely ignored by I tsing? In the काशिका, the Indian scholars found contradictory allegations and they reconciled them by ascribing them to the two authors जयादित्य and वामन This shows that वामन could neither be a different name nor a surname of the other —Was it because वामन held then a subordinate position, either as a pupil of the other or a very new writer who had not therefore attained yet reputation enough to be named as an author? Or were the last four Adhyayas of the book a subsequent addition to, or a recast by वामन of the form in which जयादित्य had left them? If वामन were either an

intimate friend or a pupil of the other, he might undertake this task of retouching the work left by जयादित्य, if he thought it requiring further improvement. That जयादित्य might have left his own comments on the last four Adhyayas appear not altogether improbable from the assertion of the न्यासकार on I 1 5—"श्रुक' कितीत्यत्रापि (7 2 11) जयादित्यवृत्तौ ग्रन्थ ।' Probably वामन wrote down his share of the काशिका shortly after I tsing had left India and so he is not at all mentioned by the former Unless there be some such reasons, it cannot be likely that I tsing could avoid or forget वामन within so short a time as between the composition of the काशिका (that is Jayaditya's सूत्रवृत्ति) and his own book, the Record of the Buddhist Religion

In the काशिका are found references to पदशेषकार, माध्यन्दिनि and भट्टाचार्य (1 2 36) and quotations from the रामायण, महाभारत, मनुसंहिता, भारवि and नानार्थकोष , besides, stray lines such as सा हि तस्य धनक्रीता प्राणेभ्योऽपि गरीयसी, केनेद लिखित चित्र मनोनेत्रविकाशि यत्, घटदिति गम्भीरमम्बुदैर्नदितम् &c. The verse सा हि तस्य धनक्रीता &c is assigned to भट्टि by माधव in his धातुवृत्ति (on the root डुक्रीञ्) and भट्टोजि in his शब्दकौस्तुभ in II ii 19 But it is not met with in the भट्टिकाव्य. To II 1 55 in the काशिका, the examples हसगद्गदा and न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डला and again to VI 2 2 these two and दूर्वाकाण्डश्यामा are supplied This reminds one of the stanza in the भट्टिकाव्य

योषिद्वृन्दारिका तस्य दयिता हसनादिनी ।
दूर्वाकाण्डमिव श्यामा न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डला ॥ १ ॥ (V 18)

If there be any borrowing here, the grammarian is the borrower, supposing that the भागवृत्ति is prior to the काशिका। As however जयादित्य quotes भारवि and refers to the वाक्यपदीय, I-tsing's chronology is sufficiently borne out Nothing is known of the life, parentage &c of जयादित्य and वामन It is said that they were Buddhists, for they commenced their work without any statement of salutation to a god, supplied such un Brahminic illustration as नयते चार्वी लोकायते &c , mutilated the aphorisms of the sage or often augmented them by interpolations No Brahmin classical author would do it, as it would lead to a wrong पारायण and be a sacrilege

This famous work the काशिकावृत्ति, sometimes called the सद्वृत्ति or the महावृत्ति, is now the only extant independent complete commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी written in accordance with the order of the Sutras as laid down by पाणिनि himself The शब्दकौस्तुभ would have been another such work independently composed, if भट्टोजि could finish it If is said that he died before its completion The व्याकरणमिताक्षरा by अन्नम्भट्ट, (21) the वैयाकरणसर्वस्व by धरणीधरकाशीनाथ composed in 1809 A D

---

(21) The beginning of the व्याकरणमिताक्षरा is

शिव साम्ब नमस्कृत्य गणेशञ्च सरस्वतीम् ।
पाणिनीयमतेनाह वृत्तिं कुर्व्वे मिताक्षराम् ॥ १ ॥

and the colophon is—

ग्रन्थविस्तरभीरुभ्य इय वृत्तिर्मया कृता ।
यया व्याकरण सर्व्वं करस्थामलकायते ॥ १ ॥

on the request by Henry Colebrook (22) and the Scholium prepared in 1839 42 A D by two unknown pundits appointed by Dr Boethlinck, were all, more or less, based on the materials supplied by the काशिका They are not enough to make one understand पाणिनि fully and clearly In fact, had the काशिका been not written at all or defunct, the need for a systematic Sanskrit Grammar treating both the holy and profane parts of the language, would have been awfully great The study of the अष्टाध्यायी then would have disappeared altogether or lingered only with a very few scholars Its importance and necessity cannot therefore be overstated The term काशिका is thus explained—काशयति प्रकाशयति सूत्रार्थमिति काशिका। काश्यां भवा वा। हरदत्त favours the second etymology,—"काशिकेति देशतोऽभिधानम्। काशिषु भवा।"—So they prepared it at Benares,—that eternal city and centre of Sanskrit learning in India

(10) जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि।

जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is the author of the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका It is variously called the काशिकाविवरणपञ्चिका, काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका, काशिकान्यास, जिनेन्द्रन्यास or the न्यास The name न्यास is because of its methodical justification of the statements of the text commented upon (23) The न्यास was most likely the first of the commentaries written on the Kasika Another of its commentaries is the पदमञ्जरी by हरदत्तमिश्र Says he in the Introduction of his book

तात पद्मकुमाराख्यं प्रणम्याम्बां श्रियं तथा।
ज्येष्ठं चाग्निकुमाराख्यमाचार्यमपराजितम्॥ १॥
यस्तिराय हरदत्तसञ्ज्ञया विश्रुतो दशसु दिक्षु दक्षिण।
उज्जहार पदमञ्जरीमसौ शब्दशास्त्रसहकारपादपात॥ २॥

The variants in (1) are रुद्रकुमाराख्यम्, पद्मकुमारार्य्यम् and चाग्निकुमारार्य्यम्। if these variants are the real readings and contain आर्य्य, हरदत्त was clearly a Madras Iyer. From a varnacular word कूचिमञ्चि used by him in his book, this assertion is further confirmed He often speaks of his own merit thus —

---

(22) The colophan of the वैयाकरणसर्वस्व runs thus—
देशे श्रीमति वङ्गनाम्नि नगरे श्रीकलकत्ताभिधे
श्रीमत्तामसहेन्रक कुलबुरुक्साहेवदत्ताज्ञया।
प्रारब्धं धरणीधरेण विदुषा व्याख्यानकं पाणिनेः
सूत्राणां समनुक्रमेण च महाभाष्येण तट्टीकया॥ १॥
कौमुद्यापि च काशिकासहितया सयुक्तकं वार्त्तिकै
स्तद्वत् सर्वगणै सहैव च परीभाषेष्टिभि र्मिश्रितम्।
मूढानां द्रुतबोधदं च सुमहत् सर्वोपकारक्षम
काशीनाथ इतीरितो बुधवर पूर्णीचकाराथ तत॥ २
गौरीपुत्रमुखर्तुनागधरणीसवत्सरे (१८६६) वैक्रमे
भूवैश्वानरसप्तचन्द्रकमिते शाके (१७३१) तपस्ये सिते।
पक्षे सूर्य्यतिथौ विधौ सुदिवसे विप्रस्तु सारस्वतो
वाबूरामसमाख्ययातिविदितो मुद्राक्षरै र्न्यस्तवान्॥ ३॥
(23) न्यस्यते स्थाप्यते दृढीक्रियतेऽनेनेति न्यास.।

एव प्रकटितोऽस्माभिर्भाष्ये परिचय पर ।
तस्य नि शेषतो मन्ये प्रतिपत्तापि दुर्लभ ॥१॥
Again प्रक्रियातर्कगहनप्रविष्टो हृष्टमानस ।
हरदत्तहरि स्वैर विहरन् केन वार्य्यते ॥१॥

Though he boasts of the superiority of his work (24) to all other commentaries on the काशिका, said to be existing by hundreds, yet it is doubtful if he has been able to dislodge the न्यास from its pedestal of the first and best of its kind जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि was a grammarian of extraordinary acumen His grammatical knowledge and insight were intensely keen , his studies and acquirements vast, deep and varied His memory, as evidenced from his book, was wonderful His book is a veritable repositary of minute, cogent and incisive reasonings Its sterling merits deservedly acquired for it, a worldwide fame The scholars sang its praises —

यत पञ्जिकानावमिमामासाद्य सुधिय' सुखम् ।
तरन्ति काशिकाम्भोधि' स जिनेन्द्रो जयत्ययम् ॥ १ ॥

and again

उच्चारित शेषमुखैरशेषैर्व्याख्यामृत शब्दमहार्णवस्य ।
न्यासीकृत येन जिनेन्द्रकेन तस्मै नमः शाब्दिकवन्दिताय ॥१॥

सृष्टिधराचार्य्य of the भाषावृत्त्यर्थविवृति based his work on it and he says —

न्यासग्रन्थार्थतात्पर्य्यपर्य्यालोचनशालिभिः ।
बोध्योऽय करुणावद्भिः कृतिभिर् मे परिश्रम ॥ १ ॥

The न्यास has a commentary of its own in common with the काशिका by मत्रेयरक्षित It is called the तन्त्रप्रदीप Says मैत्रेय in his धातुप्रदीप—

मञ्जुघोषप्रसादेन धातूना वृत्तिमारभे ।
बहुशोऽसून् यथा भीम प्रोक्तवास्तद्वदागमात् ॥ १ ॥

Again in the colophon वृत्तिन्यासौ (स)समुद्दिश्य कृतवान् ग्रन्थविस्तरम् ।
नाम्ना तन्त्रप्रदीप यो विवृतास्तेन धातव ॥ २ ॥
आकृष्य भाष्यजलधे रथ धातुनामपारायणक्षपणपाणिनिशास्त्रवेदी ।
कालापचान्द्रमततत्त्वविभागदक्षो धातुप्रदीपमकरोज्जगतो हिताय ॥ ३ ॥
He composed his books in about 1100 A D

Some say that this तन्त्रप्रदीप is probably identical with the अनुन्यास, or the न्यासोद्योत । माधवाचार्य्य often refers to it by the name of वृत्तिप्रदीप after the भाष्यप्रदीप by कैयट ।

Nothing is known regarding the birth place, parentage and life of the न्यासकार । बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य्य being a title of his, it is plain that he was a Buddhist Some take him as a जैन । भट्टोजि called him वेदवाह्य (25), because he was not a

(24) अविचारितरमणीय काम व्याख्याशत भवतु वृत्तेः ।
हृदयङ्गमा भविष्यति गुणग्राहिणामिय' व्याख्या ॥ १ ॥"

(25) "यत्तु न्यासकृतोक्त सुद्गलानीशब्दे द्वितीय उदात्त इति तद्वेदवाह्यत्वप्रयुक्तमेव । खितीति (६।१।९३) प्रत्ययात् पूर्वस्य विधीयमानं सन्निहितमानुकं विहाय द्वितीये प्रवर्त्तत इत्यत्र वीजाभावात्। सकलवैदिकपाठरोधाच्च ।" (प्रौढ़मनोरमा, वैदिकप्रक्रिया on 4 1 49)

Brahmin बोधिसत्त्वदेशीय is by the तद्धित affix देशीयर् (५।३।६७)। Another view asserts देशीय with the affix छ under गहादि (४।२।३८) or with छ to बोधिसत्त्वदेश by एङ् प्राचां देशे (1 1 75) As to his age the internal evidences are very few and far between जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि names a poem सीताहरण in II 1 15 There is nothing to show that the न्यासकार means by it the जानकीहरण by the Buddhist poet कुमारदास In VI 1 74, he quotes मा बालिपथमन्वगा which is from the रामायण (Book IV 30 81 and 34 18) In II 11 16 is भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहर्त्ता (त्ता) likely from the महाभारत In IV 1 20 is the stanza

पिता रक्षति कौमारे भर्त्ता रक्षति यौवने ।
पुत्रस्तु स्थाविरे भावे न स्त्री स्वातन्त्र्यमर्हति ॥ १ ॥

Which occurs in the मनुसंहिता In III 11 87 he discourses on वृत्रस्य हन्तु which may remind one of the line वृत्रस्य हन्तुः कुलिश कुण्ठिताश्रीव लक्ष्यते in the कुमारसम्भव in viii 2 80 is अहरहर्नयमानो गामश्वं पुरुषं पशुम् which is from the महाभारत, In III 11 21 is जातिरिव किङ्करी in III 11 174 कान्तो हरिश्चन्द्र इव प्रजानाम् , in VI 2 187 is तत्रोपासितलोकभर्त्तरि , in VI 111 67 शिरो मे श्रीर्यशो मे श्री and in VIII 1v 16, अपि शाकं पचानस्य सुखं वै मघवन् गृहे । But their sources have not been traced

In II 1 17 stands a quotation प्राज्ञे कल्याणनामानावेतौ तिष्यपुनर्वसू which is also found, slightly changed, in the साहित्यदर्पण To illustrate the drammatic लक्षण अनुक्तसिद्धि in chapter VI the author sets down "विशेषार्थोहविस्तारोऽनुक्तसिद्धिरुदीर्य्यते यथा गृहवृक्षवाटिकायां—

दृश्यते तन्वि यावेतौ चारुचन्द्रमसं प्रति ।
प्राज्ञे कल्याणनामानावुभौ तिष्यपुनर्वसू ॥ १ ॥

One रामचरणतर्कवागीश who wrote a commentary on the साहित्यदर्पण, by name the साहित्यदर्पणविवृति, in 1702 A D, glossed over it thus —

"ऊहविस्तारस्तर्कातिशयः। दृश्येते इति। गृहोपवने विश्वामित्रसमीपे श्रीरामलक्ष्मणौ दृष्ट्वा सीतां सम्बोध्य तत्सखीनां वितर्कवर्णनमिदम्। अत्र चन्द्रादीनां पृथिव्यामसम्भवे वितर्कातिशयः।"

Is this गृहवृक्षवाटिकायाम् the name of a book? Or a portion of the text quoted from a book, indicating the spot from which the maidens addressed सीता?

There is a passage (26) in the MS of the न्यास belonging to the Deccan College, Poona, in which a quotation is found from the अमरकोष viz —"अथवा तन्त्र सिद्धान्तः। तन्त्र प्रधाने सिद्धान्त इत्यमर।" But it does not occur in the Bengal MS in Bengali characters, ferreted out from Bengal, and now deposited in the Varendra Research Society of Rajshahi, nor in the MS in Malayalam characters, which is in the Library of Trivancore Government (27) So it cannot be safely asserted that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि had quoted अमरसिंह।

(26) P 2 in the Text

(27) M M Pandit T Ganapati Sastrin assured the editor of this Vide his letter printed in the [illegible] p 1012 Vol I

As for the external evidence, it is known from I tsing that जयादित्य died in 661 A D Now जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि did not write his न्यास within a very short time after Jayaditya's demise It is clear from the following passages of it —

(a) In I 1 5 writes the न्यासकार—"अन्ये तूत्तरसूत्रे कणिता श्वो रणिता श्व इत्यनन्तरमनेन ग्रन्थेन भवितव्यम्। इह तु दुर्विन्यस्तकाकुपदजनितभ्रान्तिभि कुलेखकैर लिखितमिति वर्णयन्ति।

(b) In IV 1 2—"औटष्टकार सुडिति प्रत्याहारग्रहणार्थ। वृत्तौ त्वेष ग्रन्थो नास्ति। भवितव्य त्वनेन। लेखकप्रमाददोषादिदानीमन्तर्हित।"

(c) In VI iii 79—"ससग्रहमित्येतदुदाहरण प्रमादादिदानीन्तने कुलेखकैर्लिखितम्।"

This shows that the use and study of the काशिका had spread vastly and ranged for a sufficient time before the न्यास was composed Otherwise it is hardly possible for the scribes to so soon forget the order of words in transcription of any recently composed book The complaint of the commentator consists of the words इदानीम् and इदानीन्तने This clearly bespeaks a certain period of time sufficiently long and previously elapsed after which the copyists were likely to be careless in their work

Now मैत्रेयरक्षित the commentator on the न्यास is quoted by शरणदेव in his दुर्घटवृत्ति written in 1172 A D मैत्रेयरक्षित refers to कैयट and quotes माघ in his तन्त्रप्रदीप। It will be presently shown that माघ names the न्यास। पुरुषोत्तमदेव mentioned in the दुर्घटवृत्ति, quotes न्यासकार and कैयट in his भाषावृत्ति composed in about 1150 A D कैयट often refers to भर्तृहरि (of the वाक्यपदीय) and वृत्तिकार (जयादित्य) directly and speaks of the न्यासकार in the भाष्यप्रदीप indirectly thus —

(a) In III 1 111, on the Sutra ई च खनः (३।१।१११) says न्यासकार—"इयोरिकारयो प्रश्लेषनिर्देश.। तत्र यो द्वितीय इवर्ण' स ये (6 4 43) चेत्यात्त्वबाधा यथा स्यादित्येवमर्थ।" Now कैयट remarks "दीर्घोच्चारणे भाष्यकारेण प्रत्याख्याते केचित् प्रश्लेषनिर्देशेन द्वितीय इकारो ये विभाषेत्यात्त्वस्य (6 4 43) पत्ते परत्वात् प्राप्तस्य बाधनार्थ इत्याहु'। तदयुक्तम्। क्यप्सन्नियोगेन विधीयमानस्येत्त्वस्यान्तरङ्गत्वात्।"

(b) Again in VII iii 70 (घोर्लोपो लेटि वा) कैयट observes—"केचित्त्वनित्यमागमशासनमित्यस्य ज्ञापक वाग्रहण वर्णयन्ति। अनित्यत्वात् तस्य धत्तात दधादिति न स्याटिति। तत्सिद्धये वाग्रहण क्रियमाणमेना परिभाषा ज्ञापयति।

This assertion that the term वा in VII iii, 70 is the indicatory of the परिभाषा quoted above, stands in the न्यास in VII 1 1 viz —

अनित्यता पुनरागमशासनस्य घो र्लोपो लेटि वेत्यत्र (7 3 70) वाग्रहणाल्लिङ्गाद् विज्ञायते। नहि ददद् दधादित्यत्र नित्य घो र्लोपो मा भूदित्येवमर्थ क्रियते। यदि च नित्यमागमशासन स्याद् वाग्रहणमनर्थक स्यात्। भवतु नित्यो लोप। सत्यपि तस्मिन् लेटोऽडाटा (3 4 94) इत्यटि कृते ददद् दधादिति सिद्धमत्येव। अनित्यत्वे त्वागमशासनस्याडागमाभावान्न सिध्यति। ततो वावचनमर्थवद् भवति।"

From this elaborate explanation in which no previous writer is alluded to, it is clear that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is the first prapagator of this view If so, कैयट refers to the न्यासकार and he must have flourished some time between 661 A D and 1100 A D This limit for कैयट is set down in consideration of the reference to him, by पुरुषोत्तमदेव who was most likely a Bengali He composed his भाषावृत्ति in about 1150 A D, and we may take 50 years as the minimum period for the circulation of the भाष्यप्रदीप in Bengal Again हरदत्त

often indirectly speaks of कैयट (28) and appears to have lived in 1100 A D हरदत्त, मैत्रेयरक्षित and पुरुषोत्तम appear to have been all co eval as no one of them refers to the others शरणदेव too does not speak of हरदत्त, but he quotes कैयट। Kaiycta introduces himself thus —

पदवाक्यप्रमाणानां पारं यातस्य धीमतः।
गुरोर्महेश्वरस्यापि कृत्वा चरणवन्दनम्॥ १॥
महाभाष्यार्णवावारपारीणं विवृतिप्लवम्।
यथागमं विधास्येऽहं कैयटो जैयटात्मजः॥ २॥

So his preceptor was one महेश्वर and father जैयट One भीमसेन in his commentary सुधासागर on the काव्यप्रकाश, written in about 1723 A D asserts that कैयट was a brother to मम्मटभट्ट and उव्वट and flourished in काश्मीर They say मम्मट lived in 1050 A D and so did उव्वट as they both referred to the king भोज in their works मम्मट names भोज in his काव्यप्रकाश—"यद् विद्वद्भवनेषु भोजनृपते स्तत्त्यागलीलायितम्।" भोज was reigning in 1042 A D उव्वट in his ऋक्प्रातिशाख्यभाष्य says इति श्रीपार्षद्व्याख्यायामानन्दपुरवास्तव्यवज्रटपुत्रोव्वटकृते प्रातिशाख्यभाष्ये पटल" and in his वाजसनेयसंहिताभाष्य says —

ऋष्यादींश्च नमस्कृत्य अवन्त्यामुव्वटो वसन्।
मन्त्रभाष्यमिदं चक्रे भोजे राष्ट्रं प्रशासति॥ १॥

Elsewhere is the statement —

आनन्दपुरवास्तव्यवज्रटाख्यस्य सूनुना।
मन्त्रभाष्यमिदं क्लृप्तं भोजे पृथ्वीं प्रशासति॥ १॥

Which makes वज्रट as his father and not जैयट, which jars with the assertion by भीमसेन in his सुधासागर inasmuch as कैयट himself says that जैयट was his father, It can however be defended by taking पितृव्यपुत्र (cousin) as the meaning of the term भ्राता (brother) here,—the term भ्राता may even indicate मातुलपुत्र, मातृष्वसीय and पितृष्वसीय। But from consideration of the age of हरदत्त, शरणदेव and पुरुषोत्तमदेव, कैयट may be taken to have lived in 1050 A D if not earlier

Now the stanza in the शिशुपालवध—

अनुत्सूत्रपदन्यासा सद्वृत्तिः सन्निबन्धना।
शब्दविद्येव नो भाति राजनीतिरपस्पशा॥ १॥

really alludes to the न्यास Going through the pages of the latter, the hit in the epithet अनुत्सूत्रपदन्यासा will be found very thoroughly appropriate The reader will be amazed to find that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि invariably and studiously rejects the vartikas and shows that whatever had been supplied by कात्यायन with Vartikas,

---

(28) E G says कैयट in 3 2 115 in forming the word परोक्ष—"प्रतिपरसमनुभ्योऽक्ष्ण इति टच् समासान्त। स च यद्यप्यव्ययीभावे विधीयते तथापि परशब्दस्याविशब्देनाव्ययीभावासम्भवात् समासान्तरे विज्ञायते।" Now हरदत्त remarks there "अन्ये तु प्रतिपरसमनुभ्योऽक्ष्ण इति शरतप्रभृतिषु पाठाट्टच समासान्त इत्याहु। स च यद्यप्यव्ययीभावे विधीयते तथापि परशब्देनाव्ययीभावासम्भवात् समासान्तरे विज्ञायते।' from such cases हरदत्त is clearly posterior to कैयट।

could be independently formed and justified by the sutras of the अष्टाध्यायी The vartikas were therefore absolutely needless, as things established by them, could be deduced from the very sutras—"सर्वं सूत्रे प्रतिष्ठितम्'। So the न्यास is really अनुत्सूत्रपद and Magha's allusion to it in the stanza, is quite sure and certain माघ is quoted by आनन्दवर्द्धन in his ध्वन्यालोक and धनिकधनञ्जय in the दशरूप The दशरूप was composed in about 977 A D and आनन्दवर्द्धन lived in the reign (from 855 A D to 883 A D) of अवन्तिवर्मन् son to सुखवर्मन् and a king, of काश्मीर Hence माघ might be living in about 800 A D Taking the two limits of 661 A D (the year of Jayaditya's death) and 800 A. D the न्यास appears to have been composed in about 725 A D

Kielhorn's statement that अनुत्सूत्रपदन्यासा does not refer to the न्यास, is not tenable and need not be relied on The term अनुतसूत्र might be used in the महाभाष्य as many times as one may please, but marking the systematic way in which जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि having rejected every वार्त्तिक, maintains and props up the authority of the sutras only, माघ could not mean anything but the न्यास in the aforesaid passage, when putting an epithet to the word शब्दविद्या It is also worth consideration how many renowned and important books there had been available on the शब्दविद्या when माघ composed his poem It was सन्निबन्धना because it had in it the महाभाष्य which is a सन्निबन्धन Bhatrihari's description,

कृतेऽथ पतञ्जलिना गुरुणा तीर्थदर्शिना।
सर्वेषा न्यायबीजाना महाभाष्ये निबन्धनम्॥

leeds to the idea that it was the content of all न्यायबीज and a सन्निबन्धन। सद्वृत्ति is the other qualification, because it had then in it भागवृत्ति by भर्तृहरि and the काशिका वृत्ति by वामनजयादित्य. The next important treatise in it is the न्यास So माघ described the शब्दविद्या as enriched with all those works

Kielhorn's other assertion that the पदमञ्जरी was the source of the न्यास is equally wrong हरदत्त names the न्यासकार directly in 4 1 22 of the पदमञ्जरी (29) and indirectly often as अपर आह, कश्चिदाह, केचित &c.. and then quotes the passages of the न्यास For instances the reader is referred to the Sutras 3 3 67, 3 3 99 and 4 1 4 in the पदमञ्जरी and the न्यास in which he will find the quotations word for word from the lat er in the former

Vana's हर्षचरित has a passage viz —तच् श्रुत्वा वाचस्य चत्वारः पितृव्यपुत्रा भ्रातरः प्रसन्नवृत्तयो गृहीतवाक्याः कृतगुरुपदन्यासा न्यायवादिन सुकृतसंग्रहाभ्यासगुरवो लब्धसाधुशब्दा लोक इव व्याकरणेऽपि, परस्परस्य सुखानि व्यलोकयन्।' (Chapter III) This reading is from the Bombay निर्णयसागर Press edition. The edition of A A Fuhren is identical, as far as this passage is concerned, with it

Some say that owing to the *double entendres* in the simile लोकइव व्याकरणेऽपि, the word न्यास here refers to the जिनेन्द्रन्यास or the commentary on the Kasika The words वृत्ति, वाक्य, न्यास and संग्रह are there The first may imply

---

(२९) "न्यासकारस्तु द्वौ विस्तौ परिमाणमस्येति विगृह्णन् जिस्त परिपरिमाण मन्यते।" इति पदमञ्जरी।

the भागवृत्ति by भर्तृहरि or the काशिका by जयादित्य or any other earlier work such as कुणिवृत्ति or चूर्णिवृत्ति। वाक्य may indicate the वार्त्तिक by कात्यायन and सग्रह the work by व्याडि Similarly न्यास may stand for the commentery on the Kasika

But the Calcutta edition of the हर्षचरित of 1876 reads " भातर प्रसन्नप्रवृत्तयो गृहीतवाक्या कृतगुरुन्यासा न्यायवादिन सुकृतसगृहीताभ्यासगुरवो लब्धसाधुशब्दा लोकइव व्याकरणे The translation of the passage by S B Cowell and F W Thomas runs thus — "Men of mild manners and cultures, holding the status of preceptors, expounders of Nyaya, deep in the study of able works, receiving only good words (i e they are called good and as Grammarians they receive only good words) both in the world and in grammar " An old commentary printed in the निर्णयसागर press and Fuhren's edition takes न्यास as meaning "वृत्तिर्विवरणम्", and does not say it is जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's work

So to take the word न्यास here, meaning the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका is probably a far stretched idea It is capable of getting several other interpretation perfectly connected with Grammar, though not indicating any particular Book Besides, there is the direct and positive statement of Itsing who had almost been a contemparary to the authors of the भागवृत्ति and काशिका, against the aforesaid assertion Vana lived in the reign of Harshavardana (606-648) of Kanoj His हर्षचरित was composed to glorify this monarch whereas Itsing's statement made in 691 A D is that भर्तृहरि died in 651 A D and जयादित्य died in 661 A D If Itsing be right, Vana cannot even dream of the काशिकान्यास by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि। Neither is there any ground to hold the Chines traveller's statement as false and incredible

Another view is sugested to preserve the assertion that the term न्यास here really refers to a book The words वाक्य and संग्रह present no difficulty वृत्ति too may be some earlier work than the भागवृत्ति or the काशिका Similarly न्यास is some other न्यास which had appeared before Vana One न्यास is said to have been composed in the fifth century A D by देवनन्द or देवनन्दिन्। We shall presently speak of it If there had realy existed any such न्यास before the seventh century A. D the word in the passage may be taken as indicating a book Of course it is not the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका।

There is another important reference to the न्यासकार in the Rhetorical work by भामह, Says he —

शिष्टप्रयोगमात्रेण न्यासकारमतेन वा।
तृचा समस्तषष्ठीकं न कथञ्चिदुदाहरेत ॥ १ ॥

सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदित.।
अकेन च न कुर्वीत वृत्तिं तद्गमको यथा ॥ २ ॥

In 2 2 16, न्यासकार asserts that a word ending with षष्ठी cannot be compounded with another derived with तृच्। This opinion he repeats in IV. 1 33 in which he observes —

"अथ फलग्रहीतृत्वादिति। कथमत्र षष्ठीसमास ? कथञ्च न स्यात्? कर्तरि चेति (२।२।१६) तृचा सह षष्ठीसमासप्रतिषेधात्। नैवायं तृजन्तेन षष्ठीसमासः। किं तर्हि? द्वितीयेति (२।१।२४) योगविभागात् तृजन्तेन द्वितीयासमासः। अथवा याजकादिषु ग्रहीतृशब्दो द्रष्टव्य'। तेन षष्ठीसमासे भविष्यति।' In III ii 87, in opposing the affix तृच् he says "एवमपीह वृत्रस्य हन्तुरिति तृच न प्राप्नोति। प्रायिकत्वान्नियमस्य न दोष।" So भामह perhaps means that शिष्टप्रयोगमतेन हेतुना अथवा न्यासकारमतेन हेतुना तृचा समस्तषष्ठीक कथञ्चिन्नोदाहरेत, that is, in accordance with the uses of the learned who never compound a तृजन्त word with a षष्ठ्यन्त one or as the opinion of the न्यासकार is against such a compound, such words should never be used सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण likely refers to जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः (१।४।३०) and तत्प्रयोजकी हेतुश्च (१।४।५५)।

Now it is said that as there were many Nyasakaras, जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि might not be here intended by भामह But the अष्टाध्यायी is the chief of all other works on Sanskrit grammar जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि being the commentator on it, cannot but be the chief न्यासकार। For the same reason, he is likely the first of all other न्यासकारs It might be that other works were called न्यास in imitation of the name of his book In some MSS such as those in the Madras Government Library or in the Research Department of Kasmir State, he is mentioned as स्थविरजिनेन्द्र It is either because he was ancient or old as he had likely been prior to the authors of the other Nyasas or because he was a revered personage with the Buddhists Bramin authors too similarly show their reverence to the sages, often calling them as वृद्ध or बृहत् such as वृद्धमनु, वृद्धशातातप, वृद्धनारद, बृहन्मनु, बृहन्नारद &c , implying either their great antiquity or revered position भामह therefore very likely alludes to him Had he referred to any other न्यासकार, he would have most likely qualified him, as the author of such as बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास, चैनेन्द्रन्यास, &c, Again Panini's grammar is the most authoritative one , therefore the न्यासकार belonging to it, was perhaps given preference to by भामह in his allusion No other न्यासकार belonging to the pure Paninian school is so familiarly known now अनुन्यास and न्यासोद्योत are, as their very names indicate, probably treatises on the न्यास itself A recent assertion is that there was another न्यासकार who lived in the 5th century A D His name was देवनन्द or देवनन्दिन् and he had the title पूज्यपाद Though माधवाचार्य refers to the works of other न्यासकारs such as the बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास, जैनेन्द्रन्यास &c yet in his repeated statements such as वृत्तिन्यासपदमञ्जर्यादिविरोधात् &c, न्यासादौ तु &ce, he invariably refers to the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका। Quotations from the न्यास given by हरदत्त, श्रीपति, शरणदेव, मैत्रेयरक्षित, पुरुषोत्तम, माधवाचार्य, भट्टोजि &c, all tally with the passages of this treatise and quotations from देवनन्द are nonexitent in these writers or if found elsewhere, they are very rare So inspite of the existence of many न्यासकार, these authors all seem to take जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as the chief न्यासकार। भामह too similarly and most likely in his book, referred to and meant जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि and not देवनन्द Now one भट्टोद्भट wrote a commentary named the भामहविवरण, on the Rhetorical work by भामह He was one of the court pundits of जयापीड king of Kasmir, who reigned from 779 A D to 813 A D भट्टोद्भट, (also named

उद्भटाचार्य), composed another Rhetorical treatise named the काव्यालङ्कारसंग्रह In the commentary of this उद्भटालङ्कार by प्रतीहारेन्दुराज, it is asserted that भट्टोद्भट had written the भामहविवरण। This makes भामह either a contemporary to उद्भट or one preceding him We may therefore take भामह living in 775 A D But भामह as stated above speaks of the न्यासकार। जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि was therefore prior to him and he might have prepared his न्यास by about 725—750 A D, Again कुमारिलभट्ट appears postirior by a few years only to the न्यासकार। They were the inhabitants of distant regions and were mutually unknown कुमारिलभट्ट attacks the काशिका on its way in which it defends the compound in जनिकर्त्तुः and तत्प्रयोजकः। जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is silent here He appears to be ignorant of this attack or to have written his commentary earlier। अमोघवृत्ति supports the काशिका regarding those compounds The chronology of these works therefore starts up likely thus —The date of the भागवृत्ति is about 625 A D, of the काशिका is about 650 A D, and of the न्यास is 725—750 A D of the works of कुमारिलभट्ट 750 A D, of भामह 775 A D, भट्टोद्भट 785 A D, of माघ 800 A D, of the अमोघवृत्ति 867 A D, of कैयट 1050 A D, of हरदत्त and मैत्रेयरक्षित 1100 A D, of पुरुषोत्तमदेव 1150 A D, of the दुर्घटवृत्ति by शरणदेव 1172 A D (30)

DACCA UNIVERSITY
DACCA, 1923 } SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI

---

(30) The beginning of the दुर्घटवृत्ति is —

"नत्वा शरणदेवेन सर्व्वज्ञ ज्ञानहेतवे ।
बृहद्भट्टजनाम्भोज-कोश-वीकाश भास्वते ॥ १ ॥
शाकमहीपतिवत्सरमान
एकनभोनवपञ्चविताने।
दुर्घटवृत्तिरकारि सुदे वः
कण्ठविभूषणहारलतेव ॥ २ ॥

एकनभोनवपञ्चाना विताने विस्तारे विन्यास इति यावदस्ति यस्मिन्निति विग्रह। तस्मिञ्शाकमहीपतिवत्सरमान इत्यन्वय। That is the शक year 1095 which corresponds with 1172 A D.

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE MSS

USED IN PREPARING THE PRESS COPY

of the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका।

(1) The first MS (घ) contains I 4 (A), II 1 2 3, III I, VII 2 and VII 1 It is owned by the Rajshahi Government College For details, see notes in P 332 and P 790 vol I

(2) The Second MS (ग) contains I 2 3 4 and II 1 2 3 4 Details are given in note P 332 vol I

(3) The third MS (भ) is with only I 3 and II 4

(4) The 4th MS (ज) containing I 2, III 1 2 and VI 1 4, at the end of 1/2 has श्रीशत्रुघ्नशर्मणा लिखितम्। At the end of its 3/2 is श्रीकाशीपतिशर्मण पुस्तकमिदम्। लिखित श्रीजगन्मोहनसेनेन। शकाब्दा १७३० आषाढस्य तृतीयदिवसे। शक १७३० is 1808 A D Its pages were found torn in some places At the end of 6/4 is

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिक्षौणीशाके सिंहगते रवौ।
व्यालेखि न्याससटीकेय श्रीकृष्णानन्दशर्मणा ॥१॥

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिक्षौणीशक is १७०१ that is 1779 A D Elsewhere is शाक १७३९ that is 1817 A D See details in note P 790 vol I

(5) The 5th MS (त) contains VII 1, 2, 3,4 and VII 1 3 4 At the end of 7/3 is श्रीरस्तु कृष्णनाथशर्मणि and at the end of 8/4, it has

तैलाद्रक्ष जलाद्रक्ष रक्ष मा श्लथबन्धनात्।
आखुभ्य परहस्तेभ्य एव वदन्ति पुस्तिका ॥ १ ॥

नत्वा काली‌पदाब्ज निखिलभयहर शोकसन्तापनाश
यस्या. संमुक्ति मिच्छन् सुरपुरि वसता सव्य इश समास्ते।
यस्य क्रोधाद विनष्ट स्त्रिभुवनविजयी तेन सोऽभूदनङ्ग
शाके न्यास खशून्याब्धिशशिपरिमिते कृष्णनाथो व्यलेखीत ॥ २ ॥

खशून्याब्धिशशिपरिमितशाक is १७००, i e 1778 A D

(6) The Sixth MS (भ) contains III 1

(7) The 7th MS (ञ) is with III 2 See note P 709, vol I

(8) The 8th MS (ट) is with III 4 See note P 791, vol I

(9) The 9th MS (ख) It was from the Deccan College Poona, kindly lent by the late lamented Professor Ghate It has प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 4, IV 12 3 4 and V 1 2 3 4 See page 331 and Page 1061 notes, vol I

(A) I I 4 or 1/4 indicates the fourth pada (or section) of the 1st Adhyaya and similarly 2 1 or 2/1 is the 1st pada of the 2nd Adyaya and so on

(10) The 10th Ms (प) is with V 1 3 Its copyist and owner was one श्रीकान्तशर्म्मा।

(11) The 11th MS. (फ) containing II 1,2 VI 3 and VII 1 2 3 4 has at the end लिखिता श्रीरामकान्तशर्म्मणा। A very good and correct MS

(12) The 12th MS, (छ) has 1 3, II 1 2 3, IV 1 VII 1 2 3 4 and VIII 1 4 see note P 484

(13) The 13th MS (क) is with प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 and II 1 2 3 4 see note 331 vol I This is the Bengal MS containig the प्रत्याहार and I 1 or the beginning of the न्यास। It is the property and is now in the office, of the वरेन्द्र society

(14) The 14th MS (न) with VIII 3 is from the village शाल्गिखा, Rajshahi It has at the end श्रीशिवरामशर्म्मण' स्वान्तरम। शकाब्दाः १६४६ 1e 1724 A D

(15) The 15th MS (घ) is with VI 4

(16) The 16th MS (ङ) is with 1 4 see note p 332, vol I

(17) The 17th MS (ढ) is from the Deccan College, Poona It contains II 1 2 3 4 See note P 484, vol I

(18) The 18th MS (द) is from the Asiatic Society Bengal Calcutta and has VII 2 and VIII 4 The label is no 8029 काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका जिनेन्द्रबुद्धिकृता सप्तमाध्यायस्य द्वितीय पाद किञ्चिदून। अष्टमाध्यायस्य चतुर्थपादश्च व्याकरणम्।" At the end of 8 4, it has

प्रणम्य पार्व्वतीं देवी श्रीरमापतिशर्म्मणा।

पुस्तक लिखितञ्चेद देवानन्यान् प्रयत्नत ॥ १ ॥

(19) The 19th MS (य) is also from the aforesaid Society and has VII 3 4 The label is "ग—8/24 Seal AS NS Goverment Sanskrit MS At the end of 7/3 is श्रीशिवकृष्णदेवशर्म्मण स्वार्थं। At the end of 7/4 is श्रीशिवकृष्णशर्म्मण इय पुस्तिका।

(20) The 20th MS (र) is with VII 1 2 3 and VIII 1 1 2 3 At the end of 7/1 is शुभमस्तु शकाब्दाः १६९५ 1e 1773 A D At tne end of VIII 1 is लिङ्गे गोवाद्दीनीति। अत शेषभागस्य दर्शनाभावान्न स लिखित। So it is incomplete Infact the vedic portions of the Book were completely lost in Bengal and from other provinces those have to be procured

(21) The 21st MS (ण) is with II 1, VII 1 4 and VII 1 3

(22) The 22nd MS (ङ) with III 3 and IV 2 It is a copy written in Devanagar from the MS on the palm leaves in Canarese characters at the Sravan Belgolah Jain Matha in Mysore It was got on 1 7 1915 See note p 791, vol 1

(23) The 23rd MS (ढ) with VI 3 4 and VIII 3 4, was got from the village वैद्यवेलघरिया, Rajshahi, from the house of पण्डित शिवचन्द्रसिद्धान्त।

(24) The 24th MS (ठ) is with III 3 See note P 791 vol I

(25) The 25th MS (स) is also a copy in Devanagar certified as duly compared with the original from the aforesaid Sravan Belgolah MS prepared like the copy of the MS XXII Its contents are VI 1 2 and VIII 1 2

(26) The 28th MS (य) is with VI 2 This is a portion of the Kasmir MS a copy in Devanagar duly compared It has been got from the Superintendent Research Department Srinagar, Jamoo Kasmir State, Kasmir

In our collection, the MSS in Bengali letters were almost all collected from almost all districts of **North** Bengal In whole Bengal the literate people of Rajshahi Division together with only a very few Tole pundits of Vishnupur in West Bengal, preserved the studies of Panini's grammar from generation to generation

There were in North Bengal countless scholars who used to teach this grammar to their pupils in indegenous system They kept alive specially the study of the Buddhist commentaries viz काशिका, न्यास, तन्त्रप्रदीप, भाषावृत्ति, &c Many of them have left commentaries of their own on those books One of these is सृष्टिधराचार्य्य the commentator of the भाषावृत्ति। One सनातन too had commentar es on portions of the काशिका न्यास &c

We may refer here to two Tole pundits of Bengal of recent time who by their erudition in पाणिनि Grammar, were very much reputed One is pundit शिवचन्द्र सद्धान्त of वैद्यबेलघरिया in Nattore, District Rajsahi He was born in 1797 and died in 1867 AD He went to Benares and solicited काकारामशास्त्रिन् for lessons on the महाभाष्य This Sastrin was formerly the court pundit of the Panjab Lion Ranajit Singha शिवचन्द्र had वासुदेवशास्त्रिन् as his classmate there under काकाराम The Bengalis being generally fi h-eaters, his prayer was at first rejected शिवचन्द्र used however to daily go to him and sit at a distance listening to his lectures He raised often argumentative objections and they struck and charmed the शास्त्रिन् who ultimately softened and favoured him with giving him lessons directly He returned to his country and proved superior to other Pundits There are some adages concerning his name —

शिव काशीशिव काशीकाशी शिव' शिव ।
शिवचन्द्रोदयी यत्र तत्र नास्य पराभव ॥ १ ॥
शिवेन शिवचन्द्रेण सुसिद्धान्तेन धीमता ।
विसर्ज्जने कृता यातु व्याख्यासावुत्तमोत्तमा ॥ २ ॥

His works are अध्यात्मचण्डी, श्रीमद्भागवततविचार, गूढभावार्थकाशिनी (रुद्राध्यायटीका) विधवाविवाहखण्डनम्, वासुदेवविजयमहाकाव्यम्, सिद्धान्तचन्द्रिका (वेदान्तदर्शनटीका), कुलशास्त्रदीपिका, सुधाविन्दु (पाणिनिव्याकरणटीका), अभावपदार्थखण्डनम्, दोलयात्राविधिः, विद्वन्मनोरञ्जनकाव्यम्, कालियदमनकाव्यम, रसिकोल्लासकाव्यम्, रसिकप्रमोदकाव्यम्। His father's name was राम किशोरतर्कालङ्कार।

The Last Grammarian of the पाणिनि School of North Bengal teaching it in Tole or indegenous system, was one पण्डित पीताम्बरतर्कालङ्कार of the village दीघा in Nattore (Rajshahi) He was the court Pundit of the Maharaja of Nattore He used to regularly lecture on the भाषावृत्ति, and काशिका Pupils flocked to him in large numbers, on account of his vaste erudition With his death in 1916, the class of such grammarians of North Bengal was alas extinct

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI

Dacca University, Dacca, 1923

ABBREVIATIONS AND THEIR EXPLANATIONS.

(प,) Stands for परिभाषा ।
(ग, सू) „ „ गणसूत्र ।
(उण्) „ „ उणादि सूत्र ।

When a number is put after प, उण्, &c in the above, it means the particular number of the परिभाषा or the उणादि सूत्र, &c as the case may be For instance (प, 15) indicates the परिभाषा no 15 ।

Again (उण् २।१५३) is for the उणादि सूत्र no 153 to be found in the second Pada of these Sutras We have quoted such Sutras only from the पञ्चपादी of the उणादि Rules

In the case of the Aphorisms or the main Sutras of the अष्टाध्यायी, we have quoted three numbers Of these first figure indicates the Adhyaya (chapter) and the second figure is pada (section) and third is the number of the Sutra in this pada viz : (३।२।४५) Here the 45th Sutra of the second pada of the third Adhyaya of the अष्टाध्यायी is meant and so on in other cases